

3435.6

A
R E J O I N D E R
T O T H E
R E P L Y
T O T H E
A N S W E R
T O T H E
Charitable Address
O F H I S

Grace EDWARD, Lord Arch-Bishop
of TUAM, to all, who are of
the Communion of the Church of
Rome.

By C. NARY.

ECCLESIAST. IV. 24.
Pro anima tua ne confundaris dicere Verum.

DUBLIN:
Printed in the Year, 1730.

REJOINDER

TO THE

REFUTATION

TO THE

ANSWER

TO THE

Chargeable Address

OF HIS

GRACE EDWARD, Duke of
of T. A. M. to the
the Common Church of
Rome.



By G. N. A. R.

Edinburgh, 1750.

For the author and the printer, John W. A.

D. W. A.

Printed in the Year 1750.



A
REJOINDER
TO THE
REPLY, &c.

My LORD,



Received the Book which
Your Grace did me the Ho-
nour to present me with.
I own, I want Words to ex-
press the Sense I have of
Your Grace's Goodness and
Civilities; and since I am
not able to make any suitable Return, I
hope to merit Your Esteem by the plain
and

and candid Defence I shall endeavour to make against Your REPLY. But before I begin, I must observe, Your Grace complains, in sundry Places, that I passed by in Silence, many of Your Grace's Arguments and Reasonings. I own, My Lord, I did, and that for these two Reasons.

1. Because I observed, that some of them fell in with other Objections, which I answered; and judged, that the Rest were not so very material to the Subject in Debate. I humbly conceived, that what I had chiefly to answer, were the Points of which the Heads are contained in Paragraph 8. of the *Charitable Address*, which begins thus. *Now, here I beseech you to observe, that in all this, there is not the least Word or Intimation of the Pope, or his Supremacy, the Pre eminence of the Church of Rome above all other Churches, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Worshipping of the Host, the Communion under one Kind, or Species alone, the Doctrine of Purgatory, With Masses and Prayers for the Dead. Indulgences, praying to Saints, Worshipping of Images and Relicks, &c.* These being the main Points to be discussed, I thought it sufficient to set them in the best Light I could, and to wave all other Reasonings and Arguments, which had not a necessary Connexion with, or Tendency to Them. Now, whether I did fully answer Expectation in these Particulars or not, let the Readers judge.

2. Because

2. Because my Design was to confine my Answer to a narrow Compass; having found by Experience, that Controvesie-Books of a large Bulk and Size are seldom read out, especially by those, who most want Information: For which Reason, I must beg Your Grace's Excuse, if I do not answer all the particular Arguments and Reasonings in the REPLY: For then I should be obliged to write a Volume in Folio.

Thus much premised, I proceed to



OUR GRACE is pleased to begin
Your Reply with these Words

in the Month of May 1688.
When I received your printed Letter in
Answer to my Obedience: I was
engaged in writing a small Pamphlet in
Reply to another learned Answer
which I soon after published with this
Title:



REJOINDER

TO THE

REPLY

TO THE

Introduction, &c.

YOUR Grace is pleased to begin
Your REPLY with these Words:

“ In the Month of *May* last,
“ when I received your printed Letter in
“ answer to my *Charitable Address*; I was
“ engaged in writing a small Pamphlet in
“ Reply to another learned Adversary,
“ which I soon after published with this
“ Title:

" Title: *The Arch-Bishop of Tuam's An-*
 " *swer to Two Objections lately made against*
 " *his Charitable Address, &c.* One of these
 " Pamphlets, upon their coming from the
 " Press, I sent you by a Gentleman of
 " your own Communion: And therein
 " you will find your principal Allegation,
 " touching the *Authority of the Church*, ac-
 " cording to the best of my Understand-
 " ing, fully clear'd up, and the Weakness
 " of it so plainly shewn, as may, I think,
 " give good Satisfaction to every sober and
 " considering Man,

" If I have failed in the stating or de-
 " termining of this fundamental Article,
 " I should be glad to know wherein: But
 " if I have not; I cannot see what Necessi-
 " tity there is of any farther Defence of
 " my *Charitable Address*; the Design of
 " which was only to convince those of the
 " *Roman* Communion, that they ought not
 " implicitly to take their Religion upon
 " the Authority of *their Church*: But that it
 " is the Duty of every Man, to make the
 " best Enquiry he can what it is that
 " *GOD himself* requires from him in or-
 " der to his eternal Salvation.

" I own, my Lord, to have receiv'd the
 " said small Book; for which, I beg Leave
 " to return your Grace my hearty Thanks,
 " and must also own your great Condescen-
 " sion gives me no small Confusion, consi-
 " dering your Grace's high Station, and the
 " meanness of my own.

I have read it with all the Attention and Application I am capable of; took Notice of your Grace's Answer to the *Two Objections*, and especially of the Distinction you make between *believing in G O D*, and *believing the Church*; or in other Words (which are those of your Grace) *that we ought not implicitly to take our Religion upon the Authority of our Church.*

Now, my Lord, this Authority of the Church, being the fundamental Article, as your Grace very well observes, ought to be thoroughly discussed, and set in a clear Light, which if once settled, and made so plain, that no reasonable Man can refuse to Assent unto it; I think all other Controversies with Respect to particular Points, may very well be laid aside: For if we have a sure Guide (I will not call it Infal-
lible until I have proved it to be so) we ought in Reason to submit to its Direction, and to follow it where-ever it leads us: So that we need not be in Pain, concerning any other Points, about which Men dispute and torture their Brains.

To shew then the Authority of this Guide, I demand, the following Propositions, which, in my Opinion, carry their own Evidence along with them, may be granted.

That

I have

4

1. That Christ our Saviour came down from Heaven, taught Men a new Doctrine, and confirmed the same with Miracles and Wonders; died upon the Cross, arose from the Dead, constituted Teachers of his Doctrine, and vested them with his own Authority; commanded them to go over all Nations to preach it, and ascended into Heaven; are Matters of Fact, which are not capable of any other Proof now, nor have been, ever since the Death of the Apostles and Disciples, who saw Jesus Christ with their Eyes, but that of the Testimony of Credible Witnesses.

2. That Jesus Christ did an infinite Number of Things more than are recorded in Scripture. This St. John the Evangelist tells us in the last Chapter and last Verse of his Gospel: *And there are also many other things which Jesus Christ did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the World it self could not contain the Books that should be written.*

3. That it is no where recorded in Scripture, that Christ commanded the Apostles or his Disciples to write his Doctrine; but it is expressly recorded that he commanded them to go and teach it: *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, Matth. 28. 19.*

4. Christ himself committed nothing to Paper or Parchment. He left Posterity no Writing under his Hand, for that he saw,
in

in his eternal Wisdom, that a Book full of unheard of Miracles, and incomprehensible Mysteries cou'd not be a Voucher to its own Veracity; nor serve for a Foundation of Faith to the succeeding Generations. But the Son of GOD, from the Commencement of his Ministry to the End, thought necessary to have great Numbers of Witnesses of his Miracles, his Death, his Resurrection and Ascension. And when he ordained those Ministers after a Solemn and Authentick Manner, by breathing upon 'em, and giving them his holy Spirit, he gave them no Command (as we just now said) to Book-down, or commit to Writing the same; but ordered them to go and teach all Nations; and be his Witnesses as far as the Extremities of the Earth. And 'tis manifest, that the principal Care and chief Sinew of their Ministry was the fulfilling of this Precept of their heavenly Master. They bore Testimony to the People, whom they converted, and to the Pastors whom they established, of the certainty of the Resurrection of our Lord. They confirmed them in the Belief of it, and of his mysterious Doctrine by their Miracles: And gave Injunctions to the newly ordain'd Pastors, to ordain after the same Authentick Manner, that they themselves had been ordain'd, other Pastors and Ministers of the Gospel to be Witnesses in all Ages to come of the same Truths. St. Paul said to Timothy II. to Tim. 2. 2. *The Things which you heard from me by Many Witnesses, these do you recommend to faithful Persons,*

sons, who may be capable of instructing others in the same Manner. It's true, the Apostles writ upon many Occasions, but never with a Design to leave a compleat Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine. They composed a small Abstract of the Life and Death of our Blessed Redeemer, and of the Church's Birth and Infancy: They also wrote to some particular Persons, or to Part of their Flock; to exhort and comfort them, or to adjust their Faith, on some controverted Points, which began, already to give Rise to Heresy and Schism. They said nothing to them of sundry other Articles, which nevertheless were as important as the Disputes, which gave Occasion to their Writing their Epistles. And, Why so? Because these wanted not to be taught the first Elements and ground Work of Christianity, which they had already learnt, but sought only for the Solution of some new-started Difficulties: In so much, that what remains in our Hands, of the Works of the Apostles and Evangelists, does not make up a System of the Christian Doctrine, so full, so precise, so clear and so formal, as to be capable of being the sole Rule of Faith in all Ages of the Church: Nay, had they writ immensely more, and had fill'd the whole World with Books (as St. John says, might have been done, without containing all that our Blessed Saviour said or did) still it would be necessary, in all Ages, to have living Witnesses to assert their being genuine, pure and uncorrupted, to expound their true Meaning, and to ascertain

certain the Faithful, not only of their Origin, but to prove to them besides, that they neither were altered by Hereticks, nor falsified by their Copiers, nor corrupted by their Translators.

'Tis then, wholly and solely by the Church's Testimony, that all such Doubts must have been clear'd; and 'tis by the same, and her Authority, that all other Christian Truths became Visible, as the Light that shines on the Candlestick: Because the vulgar and illiterate People, who make up the far greater Part of Mankind, are only capable of perceiving the Church's Authority, and paying it that profound Submission, which she exacts in GOD's Name, with Respect to all Things, which regard Faith and Religion.

It's certain, that the simplest and most illiterate among the Faithful, ought to find their Spiritual Food, as easily as Infants at the Breast find their Corporeal Nourishment: That those are to receive the Doctrine of the Church with the same Confidence, as these do the Milk from the Nurse's Breast; because they are equally incapable of interpreting Scripture, or being Guides to themselves. The Church is therefore to them like a true and tender-hearted Mother, on which their Second-Birth in Baptism obliges them to rely as confidently as Nature moves an Infant to trust to its Nurse's Care and Conduct.

This

This Way of Authority is so natural and so adapted to the meanest Capacity, that, without Dispute or Reasoning, one has no more to do, for to find out the Truth, but to enquire into bare Matters of Fact, as whether the Apostles and their Successors did not teach and practice what is taught and practiced by the Catholick Church of this present Age? Or, Whether in Affairs of Supernatural Religion, Men were not always sway'd by Authority, and directed by the Testimony of their Spiritual Pastors and lawful Superiors? That it has been always so, since Religion was planted in the World, is notoriously evident.

In the first Ages after the Creation, from *Adam* to *Moses*, how did Men learn the Truths of Religion? There was then no Scripture, out of which they might be inform'd of GOD's Ordinances, concerning religious Worship, Victims, Time, Place, or the Ministers to be chosen for offering Sacrifice, and the reciprocal Duties and Obligations of Men to one another, &c.

Fathers instructed their Children in all these Particulars; Children paid Submission to their Testimony, and that's what we call Authority and Deference to Church-Authority. After *Moses* had written his Five Books, or *Pentateuch*, it's apparent, the Testimony of the Church was as necessary as before.

In the first Place, to be assured, that *Moses* had written nothing but the Truth, that he had not invented the History of the Creation, and of the Universal Deluge; and that he transmitted nothing to them, but what the Generation before him had communicated to the succeeding Generation in his Days. It is evident, that the Faithful under the old Law cou'd not be sufficiently ascertain'd in these and in many other Points of as great Consequence, but by the Testimony of the Church of *Israel*. GOD has not altered his Conduct, or Method of instructing Mankind, under the *New Testament*, as we see by the great Care JESUS CHRIST and his Apostles took to settle this Testimony of the Church, on the most solid and unshaken Foundation; and to exact from the Faithful the most obsequious and profound Submission and Obedience to it. This is what the Blessed Apostle, *St. Paul*, makes very plain in the Fourth Chapter to the *Ephesians*, saying, that JESUS CHRIST had established *Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors and Doctors*, for the Consummation of the Saints, and for the Edification of the mystical Body of CHRIST, to the End, that by their Means we may all come to an Unity in Faith, and not be like little Children, wavering and tossed about by every Blast of new Doctrine and Opinions. 'Tis then, by the Authority of *Apostles, Evangelists, Pastors and Doctors*, and their Successors (and not by the dead Letter of the Law)

Law) that the Faithful were to be preserv'd in the Unity of Belief, and from floating in Uncertainties, and being tossed to and fro by new broached Doctrines and Opinions. Pursuant to this, the same St. Paul, in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Chapter XIII. ver. 17. commands them to be Obedient to those who were placed over them as Spiritual Guides; for they stood in constant Watch, as being Accountable for all their Souls. Certainly this Command of the Apostle had been false and dangerous, if, as *Luther* and *Calvin* maintain'd, all the *Pastors* and all the visible Church, may at any Time fall into Idolatry, and become Anti-Christian. If it be allowed, at any Time, to resist the whole Church, as they did, there can be no Truth in that Precept, *Obey those who are set over you as Spiritual Guides, and be submissive to them.* But that most unhappy Pair of Head-Reformers, for taking upon them to evangelize another Gospel, that was never evangelized, or announced to the Faithful, were most justly Anathematized and Separated from the Communion of Saints, by the whole Church, met in Council. And that is what the same St. Paul, *ad Gal.* Chap. I. ver. 9. ordered to be done, if he, or an Angel from Heaven, should presume to do what they went about doing. This Command of the Apostle seems to have very little of the Spirit of these Gentlemen in it. In their System, he would have said: *If any one announces to you a Gospel, different from that, which was already preached to you;*

examine it strictly, discuss, study, confront and compare, and then chuse that, which will seem to you the truest and most perfect: Reject what I have delivered to you, if it appears not to you to be the truest of the two. St Paul is very far from giving Christians such a Liberty. He declares to them, that, in that Point alone, of a Doctrine's being new to them, and different from what they learnt from him, and was first preached to them by any Apostle, they are to Anathematize it. Is not this exercising as absolute an Authority as can be? And was it not upon this Plan, the Church always took upon her the Authority of *Judge and Witness*, by declaring which was the Orthodox Doctrine, and by Condemning and Anathematizing those who impugned it? Witness all the Meetings of the Apostles, upon every Controversy happening in their Days, and that great Number of National and General Councils held in all succeeding Ages, to which those, who refused to submit, were always reputed Hereticks. Take away this Authority of being *Witness* and *Judge* from the Church, you bereave it of Means to preserve Peace in its Bosom, and to govern the Faithful of the first Century and a half after the Ascension of our Lord; for until that Time, at soonest, the Canonical Books of the *New Testament* were not compiled and digested into a *Code*; and therefore could not be a compleat and perfect Rule for settling all Disputes and Difficulties in Matters of Religion.

What

What was then, in the mean time, and during that long Space of one Hundred and fifty Years the Rule of Faith? Surely not the written Word, but *Tradition*, that is to say, the Doctrine of Christ deliver'd to the Faithful by Word of Mouth, and written in their Hearts. And since this Tradition did preserve the Word of God so long a Time; why may not the same preserve it for Ever? As St. Irenæus saith, Lib. 3. Cap. 4. *Quid autem, si neque Apostoli Scripturas quidem reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi Traditionis quam tradiderant ijs quibus committebant Ecclesias?* What if the Apostles had not left us the Scripture, ought not we to follow the Order of the Tradition which they delivered to those, to whom they committed the Churches?

But, let us suppose, that our Lord Jesus Christ, who came down from Heaven to die for our Sins, and to erect a spiritual Kingdom, which is to last to the End of the World, and whose Bounds are the Extremities of the Earth; had commanded his Disciples to write the Laws, Statutes and Ordinances, by which he wou'd have his Kingdom governed; wou'd it not become his infinite Wisdom to constitute proper Magistrates, and Judges, in order to verifie his Laws, give Sanction to, and interpret them; since he did not think fit to continue always visibly on Earth, and be himself Judge and Interpreter? How else cou'd his Subjects live in Peace and Tranquility; if all Men were allowed to interpret his Laws, his Statutes and his Ordinances after their

own Fancies? Wou'd not his Kingdom be rather a Babel or Confusion, than a well settled, civilized State, considering the different Manners, Humours and Tempers of Men, and the different Complexions of their Minds, as well as of their Bodies? It wou'd be just as if our statute Books were laid on Desks in *Westminster-Hall*, in *London*, or in the *four Courts*, in *Dublin*; and the People bid to go, read and interpret them, in order to compose their Differences, and to assert their Right to their Estates and Fortunes. And what think you, my Lord, wou'd be the Consequence of such Proceedings? No other, without Doubt, than the setting of them together by the Ears to kill and destroy one another, and to raise an Intestine War in the very Bowels of the Kingdom. The infinite Wisdom of our Lord Jesus Christ did not Act after so imprudent a Manner, as wou'd not become even any King, Prince or Potentate on Earth, who, when they make Laws statutes and Ordinances, for the well Being and Good of their People; appoint proper Officers, Judges and Magistrates, vested with their own Power and Authority, to verifie and Authenticate their Laws, to interpret the same to the People; and to Judge and determine their Differences without Appeal, in the last Resort. No: his infinite Wisdom chose a more excellent Method to govern his mystical Body, and to establish his Laws and Ordinances upon a more solid Foundation.

5. He chose twelve of his Disciples, whom he called Apostles, vested them with all his own Power and Authority, pursuant to these Words, which he himself spoke : *All Power is given unto me, in Heaven and in Earth.* Mat. 28. 18.

As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. John 20. 21. And accordingly sent them to preach his Doctrine or Gospel unto all Nations, as appears by these, his own Words: *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; teaching them to observe all Things whatsoever I have commanded You.* Mat. 28.

19. 20. St. Mark adds to these Words of St. Matthew : *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved ; but he that believeth not, shall be Damn'd.* Cap. 16. 16.

He also endued them with the Power of working Miracles, which was to be their Credentials, or Proof of being sent by an omnipotent Power, which no Man in Reason, ought to resist.

Pursuant to this Power and Commission, the Apostles went forth and preached the Gospel to several Nations, converted to the Christian Faith many Thousands of Men, Women and Children, in the respective Countrys to which they were sent ; ordain'd Bishops, Priests and Deacons, to rule and preside over them, to *baptize them with Water in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ;* and to instruct them in the Faith delivered to them by their Divine Master, delegated the same Power

which they themselves had receiv'd from Him to those Bishops, in order to consecrate and ordain other Bishops, Priests and Deacons, to succeed them in the Work of the Ministry, and so to continue on to the End of the World.

The Apostles and these Bishops, Priests and Deacons, consecrated and ordain'd by the Apostles, continued and dwelt among these first Christians: Some, five Years; some, ten; some, twenty; some, thirty; some, forty; and some, fifty Years. So that these Bishops, successors to the Apostles, and Priests and Deacons, ordain'd by them, converted an infinite Number of Men, Women and Children to Christianity; and lived and died among them; so as to see not only the Parents of the Children whom they first converted; but also their Children and Grand Children.

These Parents, in like manner, liv'd with their own Children and Grand Children many Years; some, more; some, less; and instructed them in the Faith of Jesus Christ unto which they were baptized. These Children of the first Christian Parents became themselves Parents, and dwelt for many Years with their own Children and Grand Children, together with the Bishops, Priests and Deacons successors to their first Bishops, ordained by the Apostles; and instructed this second Generation in the Christian Faith baptizing them, after the same Manner, *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*

Ghost, as the first Generation was baptized by the Apostles and their Successors.

In like Manner, the third Generation of Christians, and every succeeding Generation to this very Day, were so intermixed, the Parents with their Children, and these Children, becoming Parents, with their own Children, as to have many Millions of Parents, Children and Grand Children living at the same Time.

So that this great Mystical Body of Christ consisting of Bishops, Priests, Deacons, other inferiour Ministers, and People holding the true Faith of Jesus Christ; and which the Creed of the Apostles calls the *Catholick Church*, was always composed of Christians of all Ages, from the Cradle to the greatest Old Age: That is, that she includes always sixty or eighty Generations at once, which are all Witnesses of the Doctrine approv'd by common consent. So that one of these Generations cou'd not undertake to make a false Report of the Faith of his Predecessors, but that it wou'd be immediately contradicted by fifty or sixty Generations at the same Time extant. If we shou'd suppose it possible, for Instance, that all the Men of the Age of forty Years, wou'd conspire together to deceive Posterity, by giving a false Exposition of the publick Faith; they wou'd be contradicted and resisted by all the Generations over and under the Age of forty Years: Their own Children might tell them: *This is not the Faith you taught us one Year, two Years, or ten Years since.*

*Appld
to
Moses
inwardly*

This perpetual Mixture of so many Ages and so many Generations, interwoven and twisted the one within the other, maketh, that from the Apostles down unto us, the Church is but one Body, that her Testimony is but one only Testimony ; and that it differs, now in the eighteenth Century, no more from the Testimony, which she gave in the first Century ; than a Man of twenty Years of Age bearing Witness of what he had seen with his Eyes, heard with his Ears, and felt with his Hands, differs from himself, bearing Witness of the same Things, at the Age of Sixty. In a Word, it is like a Chain or Cable of a prodigious Thickness, composed or made up of all true Christian Believers prolong'd and lengthen'd as far as seventeen Ages ; fasten'd by one End, to Jesus Christ, as to a solid Rock, and by the other Supports the Church at this Day, who herself enters into this Composition and serves to continue it.

It is manifest, that if a Man holds one End of this great Cable, the same holds also the whole Cable, and even Jesus Christ, or the Rock to which it is fastened. This Cable is composed, indeed, of small, as I may say, Filaments, which, taken apart, are very short, and have very little Force to resist : But the Providence of God has united them with so much Wisdom, that they mutually strengthen each other ; the Extremities of some of them being twisted together, and laid upon the Middle of others ; the Youth of some always meeting with the old Age of others ; and these

two

two Extremities of Life meeting constantly the middle Age of the greater number of Men, make up, of all the three Ages taken together, a Cable so strongly twisted and interwoven in every Part, that all Mankind cou'd never break it: I mean, that from it one only Testimony Results always the same, and equally incontestable in whatever Age You take it.

The Catholick Church then, now extant, bears incontestable Witness of the Faith of the last Age before it, because Millions of this Age have seen, heard and convers'd with Millions of Men of the last Age before them, from whom they learn'd their Faith and Practice in Religion. And the same last precedent Age gave the like Testimony of the Faith and Practice of the Age immediately preceding it, for the same Reason; because Millions of them had seen, hear'd, were instructed by, and convers'd with Millions of the Age that preceded them. And thus we may go on upwards, and say the same thing of all other Ages to the days of the Apostles and Jesus Christ, to whom, as to a solid Rock, the End of this great Mystical Cable is fastened.

So that, although, the Catholick Church of this present Age, did not see either *Jesus Christ* or his Apostles; yet she is an unexceptionable Witness of what was taught and practis'd by the Generation, that immediately preceded her. And this Generation was in like Manner an unexceptionable Witness of the Doctrine and Practice

which it learn'd from the Generation before it; and so on upwards to the very beginning of Christianity. Whence it is easy to conclude, it was morally impossible, that so great a Body as the Catholick Church, shou'd ever imagine they had learn'd from their Fathers, that which their Fathers had not taught them; or that they shou'd be unanimous in relating what they had never heard or learn'd.

And it is yet more impossible, that all the Members of this great Body shou'd ever conspire together to advance a Lie, and deceive Posterity, by a false Exposition of the Doctrine of their Predecessors. For besides, that so many Members, of different Countries, different Languages, Humours and Manners; and so much divided among themselves by their temporal Interests, cou'd never conspire together to tell or relate a Falshood; besides this, I say, all these Generations were so mixed and interwoven one with another, that it is impossible one Generation shou'd deceive another.

Hence we may plainly see how Hereticks, and Broachers of new Doctrine in all Ages, were easily detected: For when these Seducers vented their Errors, the very Children under the Age of nine or ten Years, cou'd tell them: *This is not the Doctrine our Parents taught us: Our Pastors and Teachers, taught us to believe otherwise than what ye say.* The Parents of these Children cou'd say as much: Their Pastors and Teachers, more; and not only so, but they were alarm'd at such Novelties, alarm'd their respective Con-

Congregations, proscribed the Seducers, and condemn'd their Errors. Thus the *Nicholaitans*, the *Ebionites*, the *Cerinthians*, the *Gnosticks*, the *Montanists*, the *Marchionites*, the *Manichees*; and to omit many others, the *Arians*, *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, and all other Hereticks, in their respective Ages and Countries, who departed from the Church, to this very Day, alarm'd both the Pastors and the People, so as to proscribe their Persons, and condemn their Errors: The Pastors, especially the Chief Pastors, as Judges and Teachers, vested with Authority for the Purpose; and, the People as Vouchers to, and Witnesses of the Faith in conjunction with their Pastors, who taught them the same. This is then, my Lord, that Illustrious Society, that Catholick Church, to whom that sacred *Depositum Fidei*, was committed, upon whose Testimony we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, and whose Interpretation thereof we ought to receive; since the very Scripture, which we believe upon her Credit and Authority, tells us, that she is guided by the Holy Ghost. Nay even your Grace seems to concur with me, for the most part, in what I here say, as appears by the 16th Paragraph of the *Charitable Address*, where your Grace gives this Account of the Catholick Church: *You are there plainly told (saith your Grace) in the Words of St. Augustine, that the Church is (God's) faithful People dispersed through the whole World. That of this Church there are two Parts, the Triumphant and the Militant. The Triumphant is the*
Com-

Company of the Blessed in Heaven: The Militant Church is the Company of all the Faithful who live upon the Earth. That wicked Men, together with those who are Righteous, are included in the Church; whom God can and will Distinguish one from the other, altho' we cannot always do it with Certainty; That in this Article of the Creed, the Church signifies the multitude both of good and bad Men (meaning such as profess the true Faith and Religion) and not only the Governors, but also the People whose Duty it is to obey. That the Church is Catholick, that is to say, Universal, because it is not confined to one Kingdom, or one sort of Men, but takes in all; and that all who have, or do, or shall profess the true Faith, from Adam to the End of the World, belong to the same Church; which all who desire eternal Salvation ought to hold and embrace. This is then the Catholick Church, which the Apostles Creed, and your own Catechism teach you to believe. It consists not of the Clergy alone, either in Council or otherwise (as many of you without farther inquiring, seem to think) but is made up of the whole Company of true Believers, Laity as well as Clergy. It is not (as your Catechism expressly teaches) confined to the Limits of one Kingdom, or one sort of Men: But all Men, Barbarians, Scythians, Servants, Free-Men, Males and Females, are comprehended in it. Provided always that they embrace the true Faith and Religion (for this is ever to be understood) neither are any Persons excluded out of it, except Infidels, who never were in it, Hereticks and Schismaticks, who have departed from it, and those who by it's

Judg-

Judgment, are excommunicate and cast out of it's Communication.

Thus far, my Lord, I have considered the Catholick Church, as it is an Illustrious Society bearing Witness of the Doctrine and Practice of Jesus Christ and his Disciples ; a Witness so great, so strong and so irrefragable ; Nay and of such a Nature and Complexion, that it is impossible she shou'd ever declare for a Doctrine of Jesus Christ, what she never heard or receiv'd ; or that any private or particular Member of her, shou'd ever broach a New Doctrine, and publish it so as to make a Noise in the World (as it often fell out) without being contradicted, and withstood by the rest of the Governors and People of the Catholick Church, and even branded with the infamous Character of *Heretick* and *Schismatick*. And if we add to this Illustrious Society, or Catholick Church, what the Prophet *Isaias* had foretold of her, five hundred Years, at least, before Christ appear'd in the Flesh ; Chap. 59. 20. 21. *And the Redeemer shall come to Zion and unto them that turn from Transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord. As for me, this is my Covenant with them, saith the Lord, my Spirit that is upon thee, and my Words, which I have put in thy Mouth, shall not depart out of thy Mouth, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed's Seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth, and for Ever. And the Promise, which Christ made, to his Disciples, and which, no Doubt, he is faithful to perform, viz. That he wou'd send the Holy Ghost unto them, to abide with them*
for

for ever, and to guide them into all Truth ; I think, I may justly conclude that the said illustrious Society or Catholick Church is Infallible in bearing Witness of the Doctrine Jesus Christ deposited with them, and committed to their Trust.

Possibly your Grace will say : The Church does not take upon her to be infallible in Matters of Fact.

This Objection, in my humble Opinion, carries no Weight. Can it be imagined that upon Account of such an Objection Catholicks shou'd deprive the Church of an Infallibility, which your Grace wou'd scarce deny the last of Men ? There is not a Witness, who may not be infallible in his Deposition, if he has a Mind to be so. He has but to tell sincerely what he has seen and what he has heard : So that when Catholicks say : The Church is not infallible in Matters of Fact, they mean such Facts as do not regard Faith, of which the Church is not constituted Witness, and of which she may receive false Information, as is often given to civil Magistrates : But as to the Truth of Matters, relating to Faith or good Manners, which were given her in Charge, and of which she is herself Witness, keeper and Deliverer, there is not the least Room left to doubt of her Infallibility for these and the Reasons already offered by me. But of this enough.

X I shall now proceed to shew that the Catholick Church hath Power to decide, and finally to determine all Disputes and Contro-

troverſies that ariſe among her Members, in relation to Catholick Doctrine and Practices; as alſo to interpret and give the true ſenſe of the Letter of the written Law and Tradition, when any Queſtion ariſeth concerning the true meaning thereof. And this I ſhall endeavour to prove, firſt, by Natural Reason, and ſecondly by the very Words of the Scripture.

Firſt by Natural Reason *Jeſus Chriſt* is a King, the Church is his Kingdom. Common Senſe tells us, the Chriſtians, or the Members of his Kingdom ought to obey his Laws and be ſubject to his divine Authority.

In the civil State, the Magiſtrates are cloathed with the Authority of Witneſſes, and the Authority of Judges. When they verifie and record the Laws of the Prince, they are publick Witneſſes who atteſt to the People that ſuch and ſuch Laws and Ordinances come from their Prince or Sovereign. And when they oblige the People to obſerve theſe Laws and to obey them, they are Judges veſted with the Authority of the Prince or Legiſlator to puniſh ſuch as ſhou'd infringe thoſe Laws, or be rebellious againſt them. Both the one and the other are abſolutely neceſſary in the Kingdom of *Jeſus Chriſt*; becauſe they are both eſſential to a Kingdom in general, whether it be a Spiritual or Temporal Kingdom All the Difference between the one and the other conſiſts in this, that in a temporal Kingdom a Sovereign Authority is only requiſite; whereas in a ſpiritual Kingdom
there

there is need of a Sovereign and Infallible Authority.

Two things perswade me that the Church is infallible in the Quality of Judge, as well as in the Quality of Witness. The first is, that her Judgment and her Evidence are, properly speaking, but one and the same thing. *As I hear, I Judge.* Jo. 5. 30. saith *Jesus Christ*. The Church saith just the same thing: Her Decisions upon Matters of Faith (which properly pertain to her Chief Pastors, as I observed before) are nothing else, but a Declaration of what she learn'd from *Jesus Christ*, and was deposited with Her: Whence it follows, that her Testimony is Infallible: Since she needs only to declare what she saw and heard.

The second is, that it is as essential to the Church to be Infallible in her Judgments, as it is essential to the Sovereign civil Magistrate, to pronounce Sentence in the last Resort, from which there lies no Appeal. Because the Authority of *Jesus Christ* is exercised upon the Minds of Men, as that of the civil Magistrates is upon their Bodies. So that the Authority vested in the Church ought to be such, as that the Minds of Men shou'd be obliged to submit thereunto, as the Authority wherewith the Ministers of Princes are vested, ought to be such, as that the Bodies of Men shou'd be obliged to obey their Judgments. Now the Minds of Men cannot be obliged to submit, but to an Infallible Judgment, as the Bodies of Men cannot be obliged to submit, but to a definitive

nitive Sentence from which there lies no Appeal.

In a Word as the civil state cannot subsist without a Sovereign Authority, so neither can the Church without an Infallible Authority : For otherwise, as Rebels and Traitors wou'd subvert the civil Government, which lack sovereign Power to restrain them ; So *Hereticks* and *Schismatics*, wou'd subvert the Church, if she wanted an Infallible Authority to punish them Spiritually and put them out of the Society of the Faithful ; But this she cou'd not warrant, without a Divine and Infallible Authority : Because it is not consistent with Reason, or with the infinite Goodness of *Jesus Christ*, to condemn Men eternally, for not believing things beyond the Reach of human Understanding, upon less Grounds than a Divine and Infallible Authority.

Secondly ; by the very Words of the Scripture. *Mat. 28. 18. All Power is given unto me, in Heaven and in Earth. Jo. 20. 21. As my Father sent me, even so send I you.*

Here, I think it is too plain to be denied, that as the heavenly Father had sent *Jesus Christ*, vested with all Power in Heaven and in Earth, as he himself expressly says ; so he sent his Apostles vested with the same Power. And I hope your Grace will not refuse to own, the Apostles had vested their Successors the Bishops with the same Power and Authority delegated unto them by *Jesus Christ*.

*Whence

Whence I argue thus: The Power and Authority with which *Jesus Christ* vested the Apostles, was a divine and an infallible Power and Authority: But the Apostles did delegate the same Power and Authority, which they received from Christ, to their Successors the Bishops appointed to govern the Flock or Church of Christ: Consequently the Power and Authority lodged in the Governors and Rulers of the Church, which is commonly call'd *Ecclesia docens* is divine and Infallible. This is farther confirm'd to us by the Words of St. Paul. *Acts. 20. 28. Attendite Vobis, et universo Gregi, in quo vos Spiritus Sanctus posuit Episcopos, regere Ecclesiam Dei, quam acquisivit Sanguini Suo. Take e Heed unto your selves, and all the Flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops, to rule the Church of God, which he hath purchas'd with his own Blood.*

You see then, my Lord, it is the Holy Ghost, who makes Bishops, and gives them Power and Authority to rule and govern the Church of God. Again St. Paul expressly commands the Christians to obey the Rulers and Governors set over them: *Heb. 13. 17. Obedite prepositis, vestris, et subjacete eis: Ipsi enim pervigilant, quasi Rationem pro Animabus vestris reddituri. Obey your Rulers, and be subject unto them; For they watch, as being obliged to give an Account of your Souls.*

Since our Lord Jesus Christ did constitute a Church, and but one Church on Earth; as He himself expressly declares: *Jo. 10. 16. Et alias Oves habeo, quae non sunt*

Sunt ex hoc Ovili : et illas oportet me adducere, et vocem meam audient, et fiet unum Ovile, et unus Pastor. And other Sheep I have, which are not of this Fold : Them also I must bring in, and they shall hear my Voice, and there shall be one Fold and one Shepherd ; it is most agreeable to Reason, he shou'd give them such Means and Power as are requisite to keep that Church in the unity of the Faith, and the Practice of good Works : Now, no less a Power or Authority than a divine and an Infallible one, can effectually compass this End ; since it is to be exercised upon Men, who are so framed by Nature, that they will never submit their own Judgments to that of any Man, or Company of Men, except a divine and an Infallible Authority be vested in them.

Thus much, my Lord, together with what I said in the 5th Chapter of *the Authority of the Church*, and in the 11th Chap. of *the Infallibility of the Church*, in my Answer to your Grace's *Charitable Address* ; may I hope be sufficient to assert and prove the divine and Infallible Power and Authority of the Catholick Church.

I shall now Proceed to examine the Distinction your Grace makes between *believing in God*, and *believing the Church* ; or as your Grace explains it, that we ought not implicitly to take our Religion upon the Authority of our Church. Your Grace lays a great Stress upon this Point, and refers me to what your Grace had farther said thereupon in Answer to the *two Objections* :

C

And

And therefore I think it fit to give your Grace Satisfaction.

I own our Catechism directs us to say : *I believe in God, in Jesus Christ, in the Holy Ghost* ; and to say only : *I believe the Catholick Church* ; I must notwithstanding beg Leave, with humble submission, to affirm, that what your Grace seems to infer from thence is not, in my Opinion, very just ; which is, that we ought not implicitly, to take our Religion upon the Authority of our Church. This your Grace repeats in other Places, and says, we ought not implicitly to believe any but G O D alone.

to be
disposed

Pray, my Lord, why so ? For what is implicite Faith in General, but to believe things we neither see nor know, but upon the Credit and Report of others ; and do the more or less firmly believe, as we are more or less convinced of the Credit and Honesty of those who relate them ? Do not we, my Lord, with an implicite human Faith, believe thousands of things reported unto us by Men of Credit and Honesty ; of which we know nothing, but what they tell us ? Do not we believe with an implicite Faith that there was such a King as *Alexander* the Great, such an Emperor as *Julius Caesar*, and do we know any thing of this, but what we have upon the Credit of Historians, and the publick Consent of Mankind ? Really, my Lord, I wou'd certainly believe with an implicite human Faith, any thing your Grace shou'd please to tell me, you had been Eye-Witness of,
upon

upon the Opinion I have of your Grace's Honour and Integrity.

But there is this Difference between the implicate Faith we have in Men, and that which we have in G O D and the Church; that our implicate Faith in G O D and the Church, is a divine Faith infused into our Hearts by the Holy Ghost.

In G O D first, as being our supreme Lord and Maker, and Truth it self; and secondly, the Church as deriving it's infallible Power and Authority from G O D. The Reason then, my Lord, why the *Catechism* distinguishes between *believing in G O D*, and believing the *Catholick Church*, is not, that we shoud implicitly believe in G O D, and not implicitly believe the Church; since Christ our Saviour expresly says, Luke 10. 16. *Qui vos audit, me audit: et qui vos spernit, me spernit. He that heareth you, heareth me: And he that despiseth you despiseth me.*

And St. Paul affirms that the Church is the Pillar and Ground of the Truth: *Si autem tardavero, ut scias quomodo oporteat te in Domo D E I conversari, qua est Ecclesia D E I vivi, Columna et Firmamentum Veritatis.* But if I tarry long, that thou mayst know how thou oughtst to behave thy self in the House of G O D, which is the Church of the living God, the Pillar and Ground of the Truth. 1 Tim. 3. 15. Pray, my Lord, why may not we with an implicate Faith, believe the Pillar and Ground of the Truth: Tho' we do not say, in the Creed, *I believe in the Catholick Church?* The Reason then, why the

Catechism says : *I believe in G O D, in Jesus Christ, in the Holy Ghost ; and I believe the Catholick Church,* is not because we ought not, with an implicate Faith to believe what the Catholick Church teaches us; but because we ought to make some Distinction (in our manner of speaking) between G O D and his Creatures, as the said Catechism expressly declares.

We believe in G O D, that is we put our Trust and Confidence in him, as being our sovereign Lord and Maker, and Founder and Giver of all good Things. We believe the Catholick Church, that is, we believe there is a Catholick Church constituted by Almighty G O D our Lord Jesus Christ, always confessing, always teaching the Truth, against whom Jesus Christ hath promised the Gates of Hell shall never prevail.

This being then, the plain and Obvious Meaning of the Words of our *Catechism*, which makes no Mention at all of any Distinction between an implicate Faith in G O D and in the Church, upon which your Grace lays so great a Stress; I hope you will now see, I had Reason to pass it by in Silence, to use your Grace's own Terms, which, I think, are very Good.

And here, my Lord, I think, I may very well stop, and go no farther in Relation to any other Points in Controversy : For having established the Infallibility and Authority of the Catholick Church (as, I think, I have sufficiently done) we need only to hear what she says, and be concluded by her Decisions in all other Points, when

when any Controversy ariseth concerning them.

It remains only, that I now make out, and shew to what Denomination of Christians (for many we have in these our unfortunate Days) the Appellation and Character of the *Catholick Church* doth justly Appertain. But this, I think, I have so plainly and clearly done already in the Chapter of the *Infallibility of the Church*, in my Answer to your Grace's *Charitable Address*; and to which I have little or nothing more to add, that to repeat the same again, were *Actum Agere*.

I have taken a Survey of the different Sects and Denominations of Christians in the Eastern Countries: Of the *Nestorians* (the *Arians* being for many Years quite extinct in the East) the *Eutychians*, and the *Monotholites*. These your Grace owns to be justly condemn'd as Hereticks and put out of the *Catholick Church*, so as to be no Part thereof.

I have made out by Authentick Records and Histories that the *Greek Church* under the *Patriarch of Constantinople*, have very often withdrawn their Obedience from the Church of *Rome*, since the Beginning of the 10th Century, but never before made a Rupture from, and a Schism in the Church; and as often own'd their Faults, acknowledg'd their Obedience to the Bishop of *Rome*, courted his Favour, and desired to be receiv'd into his Communion: And all this in the most solemn and authentick Man-

ner possible, in two general Councils, first at *Lyons*, in *France*; and secondly at *Florence* in *Italy*; But having fallen off from all their Solemn Engagements and Promises, returned to their former Schism, and their Capital Error concerning the *Procession* of the *Holy Ghost*, from the Father alone, and persisting both in that Error and in Schism; 'tis plain and evident that no Denomination of Christians of the Eastern Churches are Members of the Catholick Church, but such as are in Communion with the Bishop and See of *Rome*, as, indeed, many Thousands of them are. It remains then, that the Catholick Church is only to be found in, and to consist of the particular Churches spread over all the World, that are in Communion with this See and the Bishop thereof.

For as the *Arians*, *Macedonians*, *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, *Monotholites* and all other Hereticks that sprung up in the *East*, were condemned by the Authority of the Bishop of *Rome*, and of the *Eastern* and *Western* Bishops in general Councils Assembled, Excommunicated as Hereticks, and cast out of the Catholick Church: So the Heresy and Errors of *MARTIN LUTHER*, of *JOHN CALVIN*, and of all other Men who made a Rupture and Schism from the Communion of the See of *Rome* in the *West*, were condemn'd, excommunicated and put out of the Church by the Authority of the Bishop of *Rome*, and of the *Western* Bishops in a general Council Assembled at *Trent*, confirm'd and corroborated by

by the Concurrence and Approbation of all the different Sects and Patriarchates of the *East*, with Respect to the Errors and Heresies of the said *LUTHER*, and *CALVIN*, as it manifestly appears by the Profession of Faith, *Rituals* and *Liturgies* of the said Sects and *Patriarchates*, set down at Large, in my Answer to your Grace's *Charitable Address*. So that it is as clear as Noon Day, that those, and only those, who are in Communion with the Bishop and See of *Rome*, are the Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church, against which Christ hath promised the *Gates of Hell shall never prevail*.

I might here, I say, my Lord, stop, and proceed no further. However, I will endeavour to give your Grace the best Satisfaction I can, in Relation to certain Objections and Remarks, which your Grace makes in your *Reply*, and which seem to carry Weight.

Your Grace observes, *Reply* Page 2. That a certain Author in a Book which he Publish'd in the Year 1696. And again in the Year 1705; promised to answer Arch-bishop Tillotson's Discourse concerning *Transubstantiation*, but hath not as yet perform'd his Promise. All this, my Lord, is very true; And the Reason why the Author did not perform his Promise, was, that soon after, the said Author was necessitated to leave *England* for a Time; and before he cou'd well settle any where, there was published at *Lovain* in *Flanders*, by Doctor *Martin*, a Book in *Latin*, Intituled, *Scitum Fidei*; in which Arch-Bishop Tillotson's chief Objections,

tions, as well in the said Discourse, as in the rest of his Writings against the Church of *Rome*, are, in the Opinion of the said Author, sufficiently answered.

Doctor *Martin* in his Preface, promised to cause his Book to be put into *English*; and therefore the Author your Grace speaks of, did not think fit to answer Arch-Bishop *Tillotson's* Discourse: But, possibly, your Grace may soon hear of an Answer to it. If your Grace has not seen Doctor *Martin's* Book in *Latin*; I have it by me, and wou'd be proud of your Grace's Commands to send it to you.

Your Grace takes Notice, *Reply*, Page 17. That I had said in express Words, and took it for granted, that Articles of Faith defined and determined by [what we call] the Church, are the same thing with the Faith once deliver'd unto the Saints: Whereas really, adds your Grace, *This is the chief Point in Controversy between us*; and in a few Lines after you desire us to prove, if we can, that these Doctrines of our's which you reject, and which [saith your Grace] Pope *Pius*, upon the Authority of the Council of *Trent*, has added to the anioient *Creed*, were taught by *CHRIST* or his Apostles, and taught as Articles of Faith, and necessary to be believed in order to eternal Salvation, so as to lay that Man under a Curse, who shall deny any one of them.

Here, again, your Grace may please to observe, that the whole Stress of our Controversy, lies upon our Proof of those Points or Articles, which your Grace says
Pope

Pope *Pius* added to the ancient *Creed*; or in other Words, that it is incumbent upon us to prove that these *Articles* were taught by *CHRIST* or his *Apostles*, and taught also as necessary to be believ'd, in order to eternal Salvation.

If I have then, my Lord, prov'd, or can prove these two Points, viz. First, That the *Articles*, which your Grace says were added by Pope *Pius* to the ancient *Creed*, were *once deliver'd to the Saints*, or taught by *CHRIST*, or his *Apostles*. Secondly, That they are necessary to be believ'd, in order to eternal Salvation, when legally propos'd and declar'd to the Faithful as an Object of Faith; I hope your Grace will allow, I have sufficiently answered the whole Scope and Design both of your Grace's *Charitable Address*, and of the *Reply* to my *Answer*.

As to the first, I refer the Reader to the respective Chapters in my *Answer*, where these several *Articles* are treated at large; and to which, I think, not much more is needful to be added: Tho, perhaps, I may now and then, add some *Eclercisment* to them, as I find Occasion in the Course of my *Answer* to your *Reply*; especially in those Places, where your Grace is pleas'd to call the Sayings of the Fathers, and of the ancient Liturgies, *Rhetorical Flights*, or *Figurative, Tropical, or Hyperbolic Expressions*.

And as to the second: If these *Articles* were taught by *CHRIST*, or his *Apostles*, and were legally declar'd to be such
by

by the Catholick Church, and propos'd to the Faithful as an Object of Faith; they are necessary to be believ'd, in order to eternal Salvation.

This, I think, I can readily prove by CHRIST JESUS, his own Words, *Matth. 28. 19, 20. Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.* To these St. Mark adds, *Chap. 16. 16. He that believeth, and is baptiz'd, shall be Sav'd; but he that believeth not, shall be Damn'd. Believeth, What? All things whatsoever I have commanded you.*

Hence, I think, it is plain, that all things whatsoever CHRIST our Saviour commanded his Apostles to teach all Nations, are necessary to eternal Salvation, when they are legally propos'd to the Faithful; For as the Prophet *Isaias* saith, CHRIST taught nothing but what was profitable to us. *Hæc dicit Dominus Redemptor tuus Sanctus Israel: Ego Dominus DEUS tuus docens te nilia: Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel: I am the Lord thy GOD, who teach Thee profitable things,* *Isaias 48. 17.* So that not only the Articles contain'd in the ancient Creed of the Apostles, or in the Rituals appointed for the baptizing of Infants, or adult Persons; but also all other things whatsoever the Church defines and declares to be of the Number of the Things which JESUS CHRIST commanded his Apostles to teach

teacht all Nations, are likewise necessary to be believed; since they are required to be so on Pain of Damnation: *He that believeth not, shall be Damned*, Mark 16. 16.

Now, that the P O P E, or Bishop of Rome's Supremacy, the Infallibility of the Church, the Real Presence, and Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Communion under one Kind, are of the Number of these Things, which C H R I S T commanded his Apostles to teach all Nations; I think, I have sufficiently prov'd from the very Words of the Scripture; from the ancient and apostolical *Liturgies*; from the Doctrine of the ancient Fathers; and from the Practice of all Antiquity; as may be seen in the respective Chapters of my *Answer to your Grace's Charitable Address*.

As to the Veneration of *Relicks*, 'tis easy to prove in what Esteem and Veneration all Antiquity held them; and how they were kept by the Faithful, both Clergy and Laity, as a Treasure more Valuable than Jewels, or precious Stones.

The great Ecclesiastical Historian, *Eusebius Casariensis*, who was born in the latter End of the third Century, and flourish'd till about the Middle of the Fourth; gives us the History of the Martyrdom of St. *Polycarpus*, that great Bishop of *Smyrna*, and Disciple of St. *John* the Evangelist. *Lib. 4. Cap. 15.* He tells us [among other Things] that when this great Saint was burnt for the Faith of C H R I S T, the Christians, then present, gathered, out of the Ashes, his Bones, more precious than Jewels, and purer than

than Gold; and laid them up in a proper decent Place, where they might meet together, and celebrate with Joy and Gladness, the Day of his Martyrdom, as they wou'd that of his Nativity.

St. Jerome, who for his extraordinary great Parts and Piety, was hitherto, by the Learned, stiled *Magister Mundi*, the *Master of the World*, wrote a Book against *Vigilantius*, who denied the Veneration of Relicks, comparing him to the Monsters described in the Scripture, and by the Pagan Poets, wondering that *France*, which never before bred any Monsters, but abounded with Men of Learning and Piety, shou'd now produce so deformed a Creature. "Exortus est [saith St. Jerome] subito Vigilantius, seu verius Dormitantius, qui immundo Spiritu pugnet contra Christi Spiritum, & Martyrum neget Sepulchra Veneranda." Vigilantius, or rather Dormitantius, arose of a sudden, who with an unclean Spirit fought against the Spirit of Christ, and denied the Veneration of the Sepulchres [Relicks] of the Martyrs.

I might, my Lord, if it were requisite, produce the Authority and Testimony of many more Fathers, and Ecclesiastical Historians, to vouch for this Doctrine: But I shall forbear, and beg your Grace will please to observe, that of the Things related in the two Passages in which I instanced, the one happen'd in *Asia*, and the other in *Europe*: So that the Veneration of the Relicks of the Saints, was a Doctrine established and practised in the Churches both

both of the *East* and *West*, even from the Time, or Days of the Apostles.

Touching the *Invocation* of *Saints*, your Grace owns this Doctrine was taught and practised by the Holy Fathers, and Ecclesiastical Historians of the fourth and fifth Centuries, both of the *Eastern* and *Western* Churches; which, indeed, is sufficient to prove, that it was a Doctrine received and handed down to them from the Time of the Apostles; according to that excellent and judicious Rule of St. *Austin*, Lib. 4. Cap. 31. *de Bap. contra Donatistas*: "Quod
" universa tenet Ecclesia [saith this Fa-
" ther] nec Conciliis institutum, sed sem-
" per retentum est, non nisi Auctoritate
" Apostolica traditum rectissime creditur."
That which the whole Church holdeth, not in-
stituted by Councils, but was always retain'd,
is most rightly believ'd to be deliver'd by Apo-
stolical Authority.

And again, Lib. 1. Cap. 33. *contra Crescon. Donat.* "Proinde quamvis hujus Rei certè
" de Scripturis Canonicis non proferatur
" Exemplum: Earundem tamen Scrip-
"tuarum etiam in hac Re à nobis tenetur
" veritas, cum hoc facimus quod Universæ
" jam placuit Ecclesiæ, quam ipsarum
" Scripturarum commendat Auctoritas; ut
" quoniam Sancta Scriptura fallere non po-
" test, quisquis falli metuit, hujus Obscu-
" ritate Quæstionis, eandem Ecclesiam de
" illa consulat, quam sine ulla ambiguitate
" Sancta Scriptura demonstrat." *Wherefore,*
altho' an Example of this Matter cou'd not
certainly be brought from the Canonical Scrip-
tures:

tures: Tet still we hold the Truth of the same Scriptures, even in this very Thing, when we do that which is the Doctrine of the Universal Church, whom the Authority of the very Scriptures commends; And for as much as the sacred Scripture cannot deceive, whoever fears to be deceiv'd, by the Obscurity of this Question, let him consult about it the same Church, which the Holy Scripture declares to be without any Ambiguity.

Besides, if the Doctrine of the Invocation of Saints, had been new, and sprung up only in the fourth or fifth Century; wou'd not all the Pastors and Teachers of the Church, and even the very little People cry out against the Broachers of this new Doctrine; and tell them, *This is not the Doctrine we were taught by our Ancestors, even Yesterday, or a Year, five Years, or ten Years ago?* Wou'd not they rather denounce them Hereticks and Inventors of Novelty, than stile them Holy Fathers, or hear their Doctrine with Pleasure and Joy, when they recommended to them to desire the Saints to pray and intercede with Almighty GOD for them?

When any new Doctrine, even from the Time of the Apostles, to this very Day, was broached in the Church, we find all the Faithful, the Pastors and the People, immediately alarm'd, and rising up against it; the Pastors writing against such Doctrine, warning the People to beware of being infected; consulting their Brethren, calling and appointing Councils to meet thereupon; and when the Heresy or Errors made

made any considerable Progress, convening General Councils, proscribing with an *Anathema*, the Authors and Abettors of such Novelty, and casting them out of the Church: Whereas, the Doctrine of the Invocation of Saints caus'd no manner of Alarm or Commotion; nor was contradicted by either Pastors or People, at the Time your Grace says it was first introduced in the fourth or fifth Century; nor even to the Days of *Martin Luther*, that ever I remember, except the Monster *Vigilantius*. And the Reason of this, my Lord, is very plain, because the Holy Fathers, in whose Writings we find it expressly recorded, taught nothing else, but what both they themselves, and the rest of the Pastors of the Church, and the People, had been taught by their Ancestors of the third, second, and first Ages of the Church.

As to the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, and Prayers for the Dead; your Grace was not pleas'd to fix any Point of Time, when you believe it was introduced: But I am sure many of the learned Men of your Grace's Communion, have believed it to be a pious Practice handed down from the Apostolical Times. Many of them have taught this Doctrine, and some ordered that in their Epitaphs, or Sepulchral Inscriptions, the Readers of the same shou'd be desired to pray for their Souls. Of these I shall only Instance in that of Doctor *Barrow's*, Bishop of *St. Asaph*. It runs thus: "*Exuviae Isaaci Asaphensis Episcopi in Manum Domini depositae, in*
" Spem

" Spem late Resurrectionis per sola Christi
 " Merita. O vos transeuntis in Domum
 " Domini, Domum Orationis, Orate pro
 " Conseruo vestro, ut inueniat Misericor-
 " diam in Die Domini." *The Remains* (I
 will not say Relicks) of Isaac, Bishop of
 Asaph, deposited in the Hands of the Lord, in
 Hope of a joyful Resurrection, through the
 only Merits of Christ. O ye who pass into the
 House of the Lord, the House of Prayer, pray
 for your Fellow-Servant, that he may find Mer-
 cy in the Day of the Lord.

This was the Language of all Antiquity.
 The Ancient and Apostolical *Liturgies* are
 full of such Expressions, recommending to
 the Faithful, at their solemn Meetings for
 religious Worship, to pray for the Rest and
 Repose of the Souls of those who died in
 the Peace of the Church. The *Liturgies* of
 St. Basil, St. Chrysostom; and even of the He-
 reticks, Nestorius and Severus [for their Er-
 rors did not consist in this Point] recom-
 mend the same. All our *Mass-Books* and
Ordinals of the *Western Church*; all our Hi-
 storians, whether *Greek* or *Latin*, earnestly
 recommend it, and all the Faithful in all
 Ages have practiced it. In a Word, the
 Truth of the *New Testament* being handed
 down to us from the Apostles, is scarce
 better attested than that of Prayers for the
 Repose and Rest of the Dead. But your
 Grace will tell me: There is no mention
 of Purgatory in all these Monuments of
 Antiquity.

Pray, my Lord, let us not dispute about
 Words, so long as we have the Thing sig-
 nified

nified by them. There was no mention of the word *Consubstantial*, to signify the Equality of the Son with the Father; nor of the word *Hypostasis*, to signify a *Person*, till the first Council of *Nice*, which sate in the Year 325; and yet, whoever wou'd deny these Words to signify what they are now, and ever since that Time, taken for, wou'd be justly deem'd an *Heretick*. Many of the Fathers of the fourth and fifth Centuries mention a purging Fire; and *Saint Austin* expressly mentions the word *Purgatorium*, *Purgatory*. Nay, a modern Author of the Church of *England*, in a Book which he wrote, Intituled, *The Doctrines of a Middle State, between Death and the Resurrection: Of Prayers for the Dead; and the Necessity of Purification*; plainly prov'd from the *Holy Scriptures*; and the *Writings of the Fathers of the Primitive Church*, and acknowledged by several learned Fathers, and great Divines of the Church of *England*, and Others, since the *Reformation*. This Author, I say, hath this memorable Passage in the said Book, Page 57. *This Gulf hinders those who are in the Mansions of Purgation and Purification, from entering into the proper Paradise, until they are duly qualified for such Admission, in the lower Mansions, by Purgation and Purification.*

This our learned Author speaks, not upon his own Authority, but as he himself tells us, borrows it from several Texts of the Scripture; from the Writings of the Fathers of the Primitive Churches, and from several learned Fathers and great

Divines of the Church of *ENGLAND*.

There was then, in the Opinion of these great and learned Men, a Place of Purgation and Purification, where Souls were detained until they were duly qualified, by *Purgation* and *Purification*, to enter into Paradise. And cannot this Place, my Lord, be justly called Purgatory?

Thus I have gone through the Points, which your Grace says were added by Pope *Pius* to the ancient Creed; and think I have plainly proved, that they were Doctrines *once delivered to the Saints*, as taught by *CHRIST*, and his Apostles, and consequently are to be believed under Pain of eternal Damnation. I shall now proceed to answer the Objections which, I think, carry Weight in your Grace's Reply.

Your Grace, Reply, Page 21. hath these Words: "In these *Holy Scriptures* [especially if we compare them one with the other] "we say, that all those Things which God "requires from Man, in order to his eternal Salvation, are so plainly delivered, "that every sober Man, with moderate "Care and Diligence, may come to a sufficient and satisfactory Knowledge of "them.

X If this be so, my Lord, then we must conclude, that there neither is, or ever was, a sober Man among the *Arians* of Old, or the *Socinians* of this Day; or that the Belief of the Mystery of the Trinity, is not necessary to Salvation. And surely, my Lord, both these are equally absurd.

Page 23. Your Grace says: " We do not find that GOD has appointed any Infallible *Interpreter* of the Signification of his Words; or if he had, we might possibly be as much at a Loss to know the Signification of the Words of the *Interpreter*, as of those of the Holy Scripture.

I think, my Lord, I have sufficiently prov'd, that we have an Infallible *Interpreter*, viz. the Holy Catholick Church, always living, always preaching: And if any Man, should happen not to understand the Signification of the Words of this *Interpreter*, the Remedy is at Hand; for she is living, always speaking, and ready to interpret her own Words again and again, till they are made so plain, that no Man of common Sense can fail to understand them: Whereas the Words of the Scripture are a dead Letter, subject to the capricious Fancies of obstinate Men, without being able to speak for it self. For which Reason chiefly our Lord JESUS CHRIST, in his infinite Wisdom, gave Men an Infallible *Interpreter*, that they might preserve Peace and Unity, and not be carried away with every Wind of Doctrine, but continue in Obedience to their Spiritual Pastors, and find Rest for their Souls.

Page 41. Your Grace says: " But if you mean what may properly be call'd our Religion, that is to say, those Doctrines of Faith, and Rules of Practice, upon which we ground our Hope of Salvation

" tion; You very well know, that there is
 " not ne of them new.

Not one of them new! What are then, my Lord, all those Doctrines and Practices peculiar to your Church, which I shall not name, lest I shou'd offend your Grace; and which are inserted in your Canons and Constitutions of Doctrine and Practice, to the Truth of which, your Laws oblige all your Clergy, from the Bishop to the Reader, to swear on the Gospel: And even Excommunicate the gain sayers, and not absolve them until they have recanted their wicked Errors?

Were all these Points of Doctrine and Practice, handed down from the Time of the Apostles? If so, it is very strange no other Kingdom or Country in the World shou'd ever hear of them, or follow the Model of the Church of *England*, as by Law established.

But let us suppose, my Lord, that not one of them is new: Yet this is not enough, if they do not comprehend all the *Depositum Fidei*: For if those Articles which your Grace says, Pope *Pius* added to the ancient *Creed* be Part of the Faith *once delivered to the Saints* (as, I think, I have sufficiently proved they are) we are obliged to believe them all under Pain of eternal Damnation, when they are legally and fairly proposed to us by the Catholick Church, as a Part of the *Depositum Fidei*: Because Christ our Saviour bids us to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded, under Pain of Damnation: *He that believeth and is bapti-
zed*

zed shall be saved : But he that believeth not shall be damn'd. Mark: 16. 16. And the Apostle St. James says in his Epistle Cap. 2. 10. *Whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one Point, he is guilty of all.* To these I may add a beautiful Saying, and a true one, of St. Austin speaking of *Hereticks and Schismatics Enar. in Psal. 54.* " In
 " multis erant mecum. Baptismum habebamus utrique, in eo erant mecum. Evangelium utrique legebamus, erant in eo mecum. Festa Martyrum celebramus, erant ibi mecum. Paschæ solemnitatem frequentabamus, erant ibi mecum, sed non omnino mecum. In Schismate non mecum, in Hæresi non mecum. In multis mecum, in paucis non mecum. Sed in his paucis in quibus non mecum, non eis profunt Multa, in quibus mecum."

They were with me in many things. Both of us had Baptism, in this they were with me. Both of us read the Gospel, they were with me in this. We celebrated the Feast of the Martyrs, there they were with me. We frequented the Solemnity of Easter: They there were with me, but not altogether with me. In Schism they were not with me, in Heresy not with me. In many things with me, in a few things not with me. But in those few things not with me, the many things in which they are with me do not avail them. This is further confirmed by the Words of the Athanasian Creed: *Whosoever would be saved, must, above all things, hold the Catholick Faith, which, if he doth not hold wholly and intirely, he shall without Doubt eternally perish.*

It is not enough then, my Lord, to say, that you believe nothing that is New; but it is further requisite, that you believe in like Manner, all that is Old: For there never yet was any Heretick, who wou'd not say the same thing. *Arius*, for Instance, *Macedonius*, *Nestorius*, *Eutyches*, wou'd say, that they had nothing new in their Faith; that they believ'd all the Articles of the Creed of the Apostles; and that it was hard, they shou'd be obliged to believe, or make Profession of any more Articles of Faith, than those which they professed and promised to believe, when they were, by Baptism, made Members of the Church,

It is not enough, I say, to believe what is contained in the ancient Creed of the Apostles; but it is also necessary to eternal Salvation, to believe all the Doctrine of *Jesus Christ*, whether contained in the Creed, or otherwise transmitted down to us from the Apostles when Legally proposed to us; as the Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; the Doctrine of Repentance for Sins, of the ordination of Bishops and Priests, of their Power of remitting and retaining Sins, and of many other Doctrinal Points, which are not set down or specified in the same Creed; other than that the Children by their Sureties, and Persons of Age by themselves, profess to believe the Catholick Church.

But the Mistake consists in this, that Men do not sufficiently distinguish between Articles of Faith necessary to Salvation,

necessitate medij, and other Articles necessary, *necessitate Præcepti*, as Divines term them.

That is, there are certain Articles of Faith, as those contain'd in the Creed of the Apostles, at least the principal part of them, which every one professes, either Personally, or by his Sureties to hold and believe, as a necessary Condition in order to Salvation.

These, every one must of Necessity believe; because they are the chief and principal Articles; and are therefore said to be necessary, *Necessitate Medij*; and which alone together with a Holy Life, would be sufficient for a Man's Salvation, in Case he had never heard of any more of the Doctrine of Christ.

And there are other Articles or Points of Faith necessary to Salvation, when the Faithful are commanded by the Catholick Church to believe them, as being a Part of the *Deposîtum Fidei*.

These we call necessary, *Necessitate Præcepti*; and are as necessary to Salvation, when they are legally proposed to the Faithful to be believ'd, as the chief and principal Articles contained in the Creed: Since it is one and the same Authority, namely that of the Catholick Church, which proposes to the Faithful to believe all those Articles, as well as to believe in GOD, to believe in JESUS CHRIST, in the Holy Ghost, &c.

Hence

Hence it appears how groundless is that Distinction of Fundamental, and not Fundamental Articles of Faith : For since Christ never spoke, nor did any thing, but what was necessary, some way or other, for the Edification of his Mystical Body ; it is but reasonable he shou'd require of the same Body, to believe all things whatsoever he had commanded his Apostles to teach all Nations ; as, indeed, he has under the severest Penalty : *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved : But he that believeth not shall be Damned : Believeth not : What ? All things whatsoever, I have commanded you.* Mat. 28. 20.

Your Grace saith, *Reply Pag. 46.* “ Since
 “ the Time that the Christian Religion began to be spread in very distant Parts of
 “ the World, it always has been, and is still,
 “ morally impossible for the *Catholick Church*, that is to say, all G O D's faithful People dispersed through the World (of whom your own *Catechism* tells us this *Church* consists) so to assemble together,
 “ as to define or determine any thing by their universal Consent.

“ Whatever *divine Assistance*, therefore, the *Catholick Church* has, it cannot be to direct them in their *Definitions* or *Determinations* ; because the *Catholick Church*, properly speaking, cannot define or determine any thing ; as I have just now said.

By

“ By *the Church* then, or *the Catholick Church*, I suppose you would have us understand a *General Council*; and if so, then you ought clearly to shew that *G O D* has settled some certain *Rules* to be observed about the calling of *General Councils* and the Manner of their Proceeding; that he has promised such *Assistance* to every *General Council* assembled, and proceeding; according to these *Rules*, as that they shall not err in what they *define* or *determine*.”

That it is morally impossible, all *G O D*'s faithful People dispersed through the World shou'd assemble together, I readily grant; but that they cannot *define* or *determine* any thing by their Universal Consent, except they thus meet; I beg Leave to deny, for the Reasons I shall herein offer.

Your Grace supposes, I mean by *the Catholick Church*, a *General Council*: Very right, my Lord, when there is Question of *defining* or *determining* any Point of Faith: Now, my Lord, I say, such *Definitions* or *Determinations* are made in a *General Council* by the universal [either *tacit* or *express*] Consent of *the whole Catholick Church*; which is all that can in Reason be required, considering the State of human Affairs in this World: For, as when there is a Parliament to be called in *England* or *Ireland*: *Writs* are issued to the Sheriffs, to convene the People, in order to choose their Representatives in whose Consent, the Consent of the People is implied; so when a *General Council* is to be called, there is a *General Summons*

mons sent to all the Nations and Countries; where the Catholick Religion is professed, in order to send Deputies to assist at such *Council*; for, and in the Name of their respective Countries; so that whatever is *defined* or *determined* in that *General Council* has, truly and properly speaking, the Approbation and Consent of all those Nations and Countries, from whence these Deputies are sent: Since their Consent and Approbation are implied in the Consent and Approbation of the said Deputies; and, indeed, nothing is, or can be easier for them, than to make known such Approbation and Consent of their Principals: For they need only to shew their Credentials, and to declare that the respective Churches by whom they were deputed, did always hold and profess such and such things, as Points of Faith: And sent them to concur with their Brethren in proscribing the Errors and Heresies, which sprung up against the said Faith, and occasioned their Meeting.

When a *General Council* is then called; and Summons sent to all the Nations and Countries of Christendom, whether by the Emperors, as in primitive Times, when all the World was governed by one Man; but still at the Instance, and with the Consent and Approbation of the chief Pastor the Bishop of *Rome*, to whom, indeed, it doth properly appertain, to call all *General Councils*, as being Head of the Church: Or, as afterwards, when the Empire was divided, and Kings began to rule independantly in their respective Kingdoms, by the Bishop of
Rome

Rome alone; these different Nations and Countries assembled respectively, sent their Representatives, namely some Bishops and learned Doctors, from each Country, instructed with a Power to act for them, and in their Name to declare, and tell what was the Belief of their respective Countries, in Relation to the Points in Debate; and to consent to the things that shou'd be determined in the *General Council*: Nor is it any Barr to this universal Consent, that some few Clergymen and Christians in heathenish Nations, sent no Deputies to some *General Councils*: For their tacit Consent then, and their express Consent afterwards approving, and receiving the Council's Decrees; is sufficient to all Intents and Purposes; else we shou'd never have any thing legally determined, either in civil or Ecclesiastical Affairs.

That *these General Councils* thus assembled, and with these Circumstances, carry along with them the Universal Consent of the whole *Catholick Church*, is evident from what I have just now said; and are a true and proper Representative of the Church, or the *Ecclesia docens*, to whom the Assistance of the Holy Ghost is promised to guide them into all Truth; as I have, I think, fully proved, in the Chapter of *the Infallibility of the Church*, in my Answer to your Grace's *Charitable Address*, to which I refer the Reader, and beg your Grace will please once more to read it,

As to what your Grace says, that we ought clearly to shew, that God has settled some certain Rules to be observed about the calling of *General Councils*, and the Manner of their Proceeding. I answer; We have the Rule at Hand before our Eyes, in the XV. Chapter of the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, in the Proceedings of the said *Apostles*, with Respect to a Matter of Practice and Discipline, as your Grace elsewhere observes: And, if in a Matter of Discipline, *a fortiori* in Matters of Faith; where they pronounce, with a *Visum est spiritui Sancto et nobis*: It seem'd good to the Holy Ghost and to us.

This is, my Lord, the Rule, the Method and the Model, after which all the *General Councils* have ever since copied, in determining Matters of Faith: And have always, when Occasion offered, lanced their *Anathemas* and *Excommunications* against the Broachers of *Heresies* and *Novelties*; cast them out of the Church, and deem'd them as *Heathens* and *Publicans*.





A
REJOINDER

TO THE
REPLY

TO THE
First and Second CHAPTERS.



OUR Grace tells me here, you have been thus large in your *Reply* to my *Introduction*; because in reality the whole present Controversy between us is contain'd in it.

Your Grace is very much in the Right; in this Assertion: I have been very near as large in my *Rejoinder* to your Grace's
Reply

Reply upon the same Head ; in Hope your Grace will pardon me, if I shou'd pass by in Silence many things, in these and in the following Chapters, that I do not judge to be very material to our Controversy ; being (as I said before) resolved to answer only what I shall judge necessary to clear our Debate, and to wave all other Questions and Demands, which, I think, are not so necessary to our present Purpose : However, I hope, I shall take Care to answer every particular Question or Demand, which I shall judge (and I hope it is by my own Judgment I am to be guided) requisite to clear our Debate.

To begin then with these your Grace's Words Page 54. " If you can clearly and
 " distinctly shew whether a *private Man* is
 " to make any Use of his *own Judgment* in
 " the Choice of his Religion ; when, and
 " in what Cases he is bound to forsake his
 " *own Judgment*, and to adhere to that of
 " *the Church*.

I answer, my Lord, that every Man ought always to make Use of his own Judgment in the Choice of his Religion, as well as in other Affairs : For as a Man, when he is sick, and consults his Physitian about his Health ; or a Lawyer, about his Estate, when involved in Law, doth not recede from his own Judgment, but, on the Contrary, Judges rightly, that these Men understand the Matters proposed to them, better than himself, and therefore, in his own Judgment relies upon their Skill : So when a Man consults *the Church*, and believes what *the*

she tells him, he is so far from receding from
 his own Judgment, that it is his own Judgment,
 which suggests to him, that *the Catho-
 lick Church*, whom his Creed, which he learn-
 ed from his Infancy, bids him believe,
 ought to understand Matters of Faith and
 divine Revelation better than himself. It
 is therefore, my Lord, a great Mistake to
 think, that we wou'd have People to be-
 lieve blindly any thing in Faith or Practice.
 Our Obedience to GOD is *rational*; and
 therefore we ought to make Use of all the
 Judgment and Reason wherewith GOD
 has indued us, not only in Matters of Re-
 ligion, but in all our wordly Affairs: And
 yet, still it is our own Judgment and Rea-
 son that suggests to us, we ought rather to
 rely upon the Judgment and Authority of
 the Church; in the Choice of our Religion;
 because she knows the Matter much better
 than we do, as we rely upon the Skill of
 the Physitian, and Lawyer in the Business
 of our Health and Estates. And if a Man
 be in Doubt concerning the true Church,
 let him enquire, by the Strength of his own
 Reason, if he be a Man of any tolerable
 Learning; or if an Ignorant Man ask of o-
 thers; which is the Church, that came down
 in a lineal Descent, without Interruption,
 from the Apostles to this Day, and whose
 Doctrine was never condemned by any *Ge-
 neral* or *Œcumenical Council*? And I am
 perswaded, that either he himself, if qualifi-
 ed as above, will find that this Character ap-
 pertains to the Church of *Rome*, and those
 particular Churches in Communion with it:
 Or

Or if he be an ignorant Man, he will be told the same by any sincere learned Man whom he may consult. This I am sure of, was one of the principal Motives that moved St. *Austin* to hold to the Church of *Rome*. It may not be amiss to subjoin his own Words: "The Agreement, says he, of
 " People and Nations, hold me. The Autho-
 " rity begun with Miracles, nourished with
 " Hope, increased with Charity, confirmed
 " by Antiquity holds me. A Succession of
 " Bishops descending from the See of St.
 " Peter, to whom Christ after his Resurrection
 " committed his Flock, to the present E-
 " piscopacy holds me." *Contra Epist. Fund.*
 C. 4.

As to what your Grace says, here and else where, of my Way (Method you will not call it) of Writing; I shall pass it by, as also all that your Grace says on these two Chapters to Page 86. because it hath been Answered an hundred Times, I may say, over and over, by abler Pens than Mine, and of which your Grace seems to take no Notice. Here, indeed, your Grace affirms a thing, that seems to me to be somewhat extraordinary, viz. That *Religious Worship* is to be given to none but GOD. This your Grace repeats again, Page 92. *Religious Wor-ship is to be given to GOD alone.*

I must own I was a little startled at this, considering that your Grace, in your Answer to the two *Objections*. Page 36; expressly distinguishes between *Religious*, and *Divine Worship*.

I thought, my Lord, all Mankind were agreed, that there are three Sorts of Worship, viz. *Civil*, *Religious*, and *Divine*. That *civil Worship* is to be exhibited to secular Men according to the different Stations they hold in the civil Government; that *Religious Worship* is to be given to Men and things according to their different Relations to Religion; and *divine Worship* is to be given to none but GOD alone: And yet your Grace here expressly saith, *Religious Worship* is to be given to none but God alone. When I bow or bend the Knee at the Name of Jesus, as St. Paul recommends to me: When I uncover my Head, as I enter into a Church; when I bow towards the Altar; when I kiss the Gospels, as a Mark of my Respect for them; when a Priest, or a Secular Man bends the Knee to a Bishop, kisses his Hand, and begs his Blessing; I hope your Grace will allow that all these exterior Actions are some sort of Worship: *Civil Worship* your Grace knows they are not: They must then be either *Religious* or *Divine Worship*: Now, that they are not *Divine Worship* is evident; because the Object of such Worship is not GOD, but rational Creatures, and inanimate things, which have a near Relation to Religion, and are from thence called a *Religious Worship*, to distinguish it from that Worship whose Object is GOD alone; and is therefore called *Divine Worship*. So that your Grace must either allow a Distinction between *Religious*, and *Divine Worship*, or necessarily be involved in the same Guilt, wherewith you

E

charge

charge us : Since it is a Matter of Fact, that those of your Grace's Communion do bow or bend the Knee at the Name of *Jesus*, do uncover their Heads as they enter into Churches, bow or bend the Body towards the *Altar*, and kiss the Gospels as a Mark of their Respect for the Word of *G O D*; receive the Sacrament on their Knees, Yea and bend the Knee, kiss the Bishop's Hand, and beg his Blessing.

+ These are the only exterior Marks of the Worship we give the *Virgin M A R Y*, the *other Saints*, the *Relicks*, the *Images of Christ* and *the Saints*; and as to our interior Sentiments, we are so far from designing to give them *Divine Worship*, that we abhor the very Thoughts of it.

I had instanced in all these Particulars, in my Answer to your Grace's *Charitable Address* Chap. 2. To which your Grace returns this Answer, *Reply* Page 87. " When " I hear the Name of *Jesus* in the Creed, I " bow and Worship him who is God and " Man; but I give no Worship to the sound " of the Word *Jesus*, as you are required to do " to Images.

" When I come into a Church, I uncover " my Head; and Worship *G O D*, whose " Service is there often performed: When " I take the Holy Sacrament either in the " Church Kneeling, or at Home lying on " my Sick Bed, I endeavour to make my " outward Behaviour suitable to the inward " Devotion that is or ought to be in my " Mind. And when an Oath is administered, I kiss the Book of the Gospels. But " in

“ in all these Performances, *I worship* none
 “ but GOD: All my Religious Worship is
 “ directed to GOD alone, as the only Object
 “ of it; and no Part of it to the Fabrick
 “ of the Church in which I am, or to the
 “ Holy Sacrament which I receive, or to
 “ the Book which I kiss. These are
 “ GOD's Creatures; and if I should direct
 “ any Religious Worship to them, or any of
 “ them, it would be a Sin against GOD's
 “ Law; and the Name by which I call
 “ this Sin, is Idolatry.

“ But the Case with you is far other-
 “ wise: The Council of Trent and Pope
 “ Pius have bound it upon you, that the
 “ Saints in Heaven are to be worshipped
 “ and pray'd to; and that *worship ought to*
 “ *be given* to the Images of Christ and the
 “ Saints.

This is, in my humble Opinion, giving
 up the Cause. You own, my Lord, you
 bow at the Name of Jesus, and deny not,
 that the Sound of this Word is to the Ear,
 what *the Image of Jesus* is to the Eye. That
 you uncover the Head, when you come in-
 to a Church; That you take the Holy Sa-
 crament in the Church kneeling; and kiss
 the Book of the Gospels, when an Oath is
 administered. But that in all these Perfor-
 mances, you worship none but GOD.
 You acknowledge then, my Lord, you do
 all the same exterior Performances as we
 do; but will not own, that any Respect
 or Worship is to be given to the immediate
 Objects which are represented to you, viz.
 the Name of *Jesus*, ~~the Church~~, the *Altar*

(this your Grace inferted not) the *Holy Sacrament*, and the *Book of the Gospels*.

And what if we shou'd tell you, my Lord, that all our Performances, on this Subject, are directed to GOD; and that we intend by them to worship none but GOD; as, indeed, it is our Design ultimately so to do; He being the final Object of all our Devotions? All the Difference then, between your Grace and Us, upon this Subject is, that our Practice is conformable to our Belief, and that your Practice crosses so much upon your Belief, as to be obliged by Glosses and Interpretations (in order to reconcile your Practice to your Belief) to deny what is obvious to the common Sense of Mankind.

Your Grace will not deny, but that there is a Worship, Respect or Honour (for all these Terms are Synonimous, when taken in the General) due to Kings, Princes and Magistrates, upon that very Score that they are such; that Respect or Worship is due to the Statues and Monuments of Kings and Princes, who had been Benefactors to their People upon the very Score of their being such. And pray, my Lord, why may not there be a Respect or Worship due to the Monument of our great Benefactor, JESUS CHRIST, upon the very Score of its being a Monument representing unto us, and putting us in Mind of his bloody Death and Passion, by which he gave himself, as a Ransom for our Sins?

Is there no more Respect due to the Name of JESUS for its own sake, than

to the Name of *John* for *John's* Name sake? Whatever your Grace may think on't: I am sure *St. Paul* thought there was a great Deal more Respect due to that adorable Name; else he wou'd never say, *That at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow, of things in Heaven and things in Earth, and things in Hell*, Phil. 2. 10. Is there no more Respect or Worship due to the Church, because it is the House of GOD, for its own sake, than to any other common Edifice? Surely there is. Why else is there so much Pains taken to bless the Church, and dedicate it to GOD's Service? Is there no more Respect or Worship due to the Altar of *Jesus Christ*, or to his *Holy Gospels*, upon the Score of their being his Altar and Gospels, than to any common Table or Book? Surely, my Lord, your Grace will not say, there is not. Is there no more Respect or Worship due to the Holy Sacrament of the Altar for its own sake, or as it is the Sacrament of the Altar, than to common Bread? Why else is it consecrated at the Altar? Or what doth its Consecration make it to be, which it was not before? Or why doth *St. Paul* pronounce Sentence of Damnation against those, who shall receive it unworthily?

This, your Grace's Doctrine, will give the *Presbyterians*, and many others, room to triumph. They will no Churches, nor Altars: They take their Communion-Bread and Wine, as they call it, sitting on their Forms, or Chairs. In a Word, it will be agreeable News to them, to hear that your

Grace expressly declares, you pay no manner of Respect or Worship to *the Name of Jesus*; nor to *the Church*, or *the Altar*, or *the sacred Book of the Gospels*, or the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar.

As to us, my Lord, we know for certain; and have been taught by the *universal Tradition* of all Ages, from the Days of the Apostles, that all these Things specified by your Grace have been had in great Esteem and Veneration, and that due Honour and Worship were given them upon account of their Relation to Jesus Christ and his Holy Religion; I mean a *Religious*, but not a *Divine Worship*. And, indeed, this is the very Distinction of *St. Austin*, in his Answer to *Faustus the Manichean*, who objected much the same thing to him, as your Grace doth to us: Telling him, that indeed the Christians had taken away the Idols, but placed the Martyrs in their Room.

To this Calumny, *St. Austin* answers at large, in the Passage quoted by me in the Chapter of Idolatry, *Page 24, 25.* whence these Words are extracted: "Populus autem Christianus Memorias Martyrum Religiosa Solemnitate concelebrat, & ad excitandam Imitationem, & ut meritis eorum confocietur atque Orationibus adjuvetur." *The Christian People indeed do celebrate the Memory of the Martyrs with a Religious Solemnity, both to excite themselves to an Imitation of the Martyrs, to have a Share in their Merits, and be assisted by their Prayers.* Here you see, my Lord, *St. Au-*
stin

Astin calls the Service exhibited to the Martyrs, a Religious Solemnity, but wou'd not have it to be a *Divine Worship*: For he adds, *Tet, so as not to erect Altars to any Martyrs, but to the very G O D of Martyrs.* And again, in the same Passage, repeats this Distinction: *We worship* (says he) *the Martyrs with that Worship of Love and Fellowship wherewith the Holy Men of G O D are worshipped in this Life*——but with that *Worship, which in Greek is called Latreia, but in Latin cannot be expressed in one Word, since it is a certain Service properly due to the Divinity, we neither worship nor teach to be worshipped but one G O D.*

Hence, I think, it is plain, that there was a manifest Distinction always made between a Religious and *Divine Worship*. Possibly your Grace may say, *St. Austin* doth not call the Worship exhibited to the Martyrs a Religious Worship: But he calls it a Religious Solemnity, and says positively, that it is not a *Divine Worship*; nor, as your Grace knows, can it be a *Civil Worship*; since it has no manner of Relation to Civil Affairs: And therefore must of necessity be a Religious *Worship*.

And, indeed, this was not the Doctrine of *St. Austin* alone, as I have proved at large before; but was also that of the whole *Catholick Church* before *St. Austin*, in his Days, and ever since. And (as he himself says) to contradict or gain-say what the whole *Catholick Church* teacheth and practiceth, is a most insolent Madness: *Si quid horum tota per Orbem frequentat Ecclesia. Nam & hinc*

quin ita faciendum sit, disputare, insolentissima Insania est, Epist. 118.

Give me Leave, my Lord, to add one Passage more, out of this Father, before I close this Point: *Sufficit mihi* (says he, speaking to a Pelagian) *pro mea Causâ, veterum Fides, Ecclesiæ Majestas, sanctorum Patrum Autoritas, totius Populi consensus, quos si omnes errare dixeris; mallem cum eis errare quam tecum consentire.*

Your Grace seems not well pleased with our Distinction of Religious and Divine Worship, into *Dulia*, *Hyperdulia*, and *Latria*. This I cannot help; but can assure your Grace, the Distinction is very ancient: St. *Augustin* makes mention of the Greek word *Latria*, as your Grace might have observed in a Passage of his, quoted in the second Chapter of my Answer, to distinguish the Worship we give GOD, from that we give his Creatures. And the words *Dulia* and *Hyperdulia*, are two other Greek words, as your Grace (who, I question not, is a good *Grecian*) knows very well signifies Service and super-excellent Service in general, but never construed by us, so as to mean Divine Service. The word *Dulia* we use, as a Term of Art, to signify the Worship, or Service we exhibit, or give, to the Saints; and *Hyperdulia* that which we give to the Virgin *Mary*, as being the most excellent of Human Creatures. Now, how any thing in all this can give Offence, or be exceptionable, I do not understand.

As to what your Grace quotes out of St. Thomas Aquinas, where he says, that the Image of Christ is to be worshipped with *Latria*. I answer, First, That St. Thomas took *Latria* in a large Sense, where he says, the Worship of *Latria* is to be exhibited to the Cross of Christ. Let him be his own Expositor: His Words are, *Synop. 7. Lect. 5. in Cap. 11. ad Hebraeos; Si Jacob adoravit Fastigium Virgæ Joseph, sensum esse quod adoravit Christum figuratum per virgam, sicut nos adoramus Crucem ratione Christi passi in ipsa. If Jacob worshipped the Top of Joseph's Rod, the Sense is that he Worshipped CHRIST figured by the Rod, as we worship the Cross upon Account of CHRIST's suffering upon it. And after a few Words more, concludes thus; Unde propriè non adoramus crucem (to wit. cultu Latriæ) sed Christum crucifixum in ea. Whence we do not properly Worship the Cross with the Worship of Latria, but Christ crucified on it. Secondly, That if it were so in reality, it is only the Opinion of St. Thomas, and some Divines who followed him in the same; but no Decision or Determination of the Church was ever made, so as to oblige any Body to be of his Opinion, if he be not thereunto inclined by the Strength of the Reasons which St. Thomas offers for it; and therefore not a Subject material to our present Debate, which relates to Things determined and defined by the Authority of the Church.*

Page 94. Your Grace objects the Authority of the Council of *Eliberis*, Canon 36. held about the Year of Christ 305. extract-
ed

ed out of *Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History*. The Words of the Canon in the Original are these: *Placuit Picturas in Ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur, aut adoratur in Parietibus depingatur.* It is our Pleasure, that Pictures be not in the Church, lest that, which is worshipped or adored, should be painted on the Walls. As to Monsieur *Du Pin*, I make no great Account of his Comment upon this Canon: For it is well known, he was himself obliged publicly, and in Print under his Hand, to retract many Errors which he had advanced in his *Ecclesiastical History*.

I answer then, First, That it appears by this Canon, that the Pictures of the Saints, and of *Jesus Christ*, were in the Hands of the Christians, long before Peace was given to the Church, by *Constantine the Great*; and were worshipped: *Ne quod colitur aut adoratur Parietibus depingatur.* Lest that, which is worshipped or adored, should be painted on the Walls. Pictures then were worshipped at that Time. Secondly, That the Bishops in *Spain*, where this Council was held, which was but a Provincial Council, consisting of Seventeen Bishops, might have had many Reasons unknown to us now, to prohibit the painting of Pictures on the Walls of the Churches; and very probably this is one, that the Persecutions being very frequent in those Days, the Christians could not carry away the Sacred Images painted on the Walls, when forced to fly for their Lives; but must leave them exposed, to be abused by the

Gen-

Gentiles; and therefore decreed, That the Sacred Pictures should not be painted on the Walls of the Churches.

But be this as it will; it is evident from this very Canon, that the Sacred Pictures were in Use among the Christians, and worshipped by them as early, at least, as the Year 305. So that your Grace might very well have spared your self the Pains of quoting this Canon, which is so far from denying the Worship of Pictures or Images, that it expressly establishes it.



T O T H E T H I R D C H A P T E R.

YOUR Grace begins your *Reply* to the 3d Chapter of my Answer, with telling me, that tho' I had attempted to prove, in my Answer to the *Address*, &c. the *Pope's Supremacy*, and the other Points specified by your Grace; Yet I did not offer any Proof of the necessity of believing them, or that God requires this Belief as a Condition of Salvation.

To this I answer, my Lord, I cou'd not imagine that a Doctrine expressly declared in the *New Testament*, proposed by the *Catholick Church* to the Faithful, held and Practiced in all Ages, from the Beginning of Christianity, and confirmed by the Testimony and Authority of the Holy Fathers; should need any farther Proof in order to oblige

oblige the Faithful to believe them necessary to Salation : But since your Grace is not pleased with this alone: I took Care, early in this REJOINER to add the best Proof in the World for this and all the Points insisted upon; namely the Words of *Christ Jesus : Go, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.* Here Christ requires under Pain of Damnation to believe all things whatsoever he had commanded his Apostles : These are all things, which Christ had commanded his Apostles ; as I have fully proved : *Ergo, &c.* So that, I hope, your Grace hath now had full Satisfaction, as to the Proof of their being necessary to-Salvation.

Here, I think, my Lord, I might pass over in Silence all the Rest of your Grace's Reply to this Chapter : For since I have plainly proved *St. Peter's Primacy* or *Supremacy*, and consequently that of his Successors the Bishops of *Rome* to be a Doctrine of Christ, and an Institution of his own Making ; as also that the Belief thereof is necessary to Salvation, I see no Need of giving my self the Trouble of Writing any more upon that Head ; or of answering the many Questions put, and Demands made by your Grace, with Respect to the Persons and Qualifications of the Popes or Bishops of *Rome*. However I will endeavour to
clear

clear up the Passage of St. *Cyprian*, which, in my Opinion, makes out the Bishop of *Rome's* Primacy and Power over all other Bishops, as that of St. *Peter* was over the Rest of the Apostles; and to which, I beg Leave, to affirm your Grace hath not done Justice enough.

To prove the *Bishop of Rome's Primacy* or *Supremacy*, in my Answer to your Grace's *Charitable Address*, I had brought the Testimony of five ancient Fathers of *the Church*, viz. of St. *Ireneus*, who had seen the Disciples of the Apostles and conversed with them; of *Tertullian*, a great and learned Doctor of the second Century; of St. *Cyprian*, a Holy and learned Father of the third Century, Bishop of *Carthage* in *Africa* and Martyred for the Faith of *Jesus Christ* in that once great City; and of St. *Jerome*, and St. *Austin*, two of the greatest Luminaries that ever the Church of Christ produced, Contemporaries in the fourth and fifth Century. All these great Men so plainly and evidently bear Witness of the Power and Pre-eminence of the See and Bishops of *Rome* over all other Sees and Bishops, that, I must own, it is not without some Astonishment I see your Grace so slightly pass over, and make so little Account of them. But for as much as there is something peculiar in the Passage of St. *Cyprian*, I shall here bring it again upon the Stage. "Hoc erant utique (saith this Father) "et cæteri Apostoli quod fuit
 "Petrus, pari Consortio præditi, et Honoris
 "et Potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, Primatus Petro datur ut una
 "Christi

“Christi Ecclesia, et Cathedra una Mon-
 “stretur.” *The Rest of the Apostles were
 the same as Peter, vested with alike Fellowship
 both of Honour and Power; but a Beginning
 proceeds from Unity: The Primacy is given to
 Peter, that it might appear, the Church of
 Christ was one, and the Chair one.*

To this Passage, my Lord, I think, your
 Grace has not done Justice: For in reciting
 it here, *Page 109.* You were pleas'd to leave
 out that Part of the Passage, for which I
 quoted the whole: For your Grace only re-
 cites the first Part: *The Rest of the Apostles
 were the same as Peter, vested with alike Fel-
 lowship both of Honour and Power; and there
 stop: whereas the whole strefs of our Con-
 troversy lies upon the following Part of the
 said Passage: But a Beginning proceeds from
 Unity: The Primacy is given to Peter, that it
 might appear the Church of Christ was one and
 the Chair one.*

This, I humbly conceive, my Lord, was
 the thing your Grace was to consider;
 whereas you only considered the first Part,
 where St. Cyprian says: *The Rest of the Apo-
 stles were the same as Peter, vested with alike
 Fellowship both of Honour and Power.*

From which Words your Grace infer that
 the Rest of the Apostles were equal to St.
 Peter both in Honour and Power. This In-
 ference, my Lord, I grant is true in the
 Sense which St. Cyprian took it: But your
 Grace knows very well, there are two sorts
 of Power: *Potestas Ordinis, et Potestas Ju-
 risdictionis*, a Power of Order and a Power of
Jurisdiction. All the Apostles had an equal
 Power

Power of Order with *St. Peter*, that is of ordaining Bishops, Priests and Deacons; of remitting and retaining Sins, and of preaching the Gospel, and so have all the Bishops of the *Catholick Church* an equal Power with the Pope or Bishop of *Rome*, of doing the Episcopal Functions without the Bounds and Limits of their own Diocesses. But this is not the Power we are now upon: It is the Power of Jurisdiction, absolutely necessary to maintain Unity in the Church and to preserve it from *Schism* and *Faction*: And in order hereunto, *St. Cyprian* saith: *The Primacy is given to Peter, that it might appear the Church of Christ was one and the Chair one.*

And *St. Jerome*; *That therefore among the twelve one is chosen, that a Head being appointed the Cause of Schism might be removed:* “*Ideo inter duodecem unus eligitur, ut Capite constituto Schismatis tollatur Occasio*” Had your Grace then added the second Part of this Passage, our Controversy wou’d end, the Primacy of the Successors of *St. Peter* wou’d visibly appear.





TO THE
SIXTH CHAPTER.

I Have on purpose passed by your Grace's *Reply* to the fourth and fifth Chapters, for the Reasons premised in the Beginning of this Work ; and beg Leave to pass by also, for the same Reasons, many other of your Grace's Objections and Assertions in my *Rejoinder* to this sixth Chapter ; being resolved to answer only that Part thereof, which hath any real or apparent Difficulties.

I had said in the sixth Chapter in my Answer to your Grace's *Charitable Address*, that in the *Mass* there was offered to GOD *a true, proper, propitiatory Sacrifice*, &c. To prove this Assertion, I produced the Words of the Evangelist St. *Luke*, of St. *Paul* ; as also the Testimony of the ancient *Oriental Liturgies*, together with the Testimony of the ancient Holy Fathers both of the *Eastern* and *Western* Churches ; and shall now make some Reflections upon your Grace's *Reply* to these Particulars. To begin with the Words of St. *Luke*.

I had said, that St. Luke saith : *Hoc est Corpus meum quod pro vobis datur* ; This is my Body which is given for you ; and prayed your Grace wou'd please to take Notice, that the Evangelist St. Luke did not say : *Hoc est Corpus meum quod vobis datur* ; This is my Body which is given to you ; but : *Hoc est Corpus meum quod pro vobis datur*. This is my Body which is given for you. Notwithstanding your Grace was not pleased to take any great Notice thereof ; and yet the whole Strefs of our Controversy here, depends upon our distinguishing between these two Manners of Expression ; as, indeed, they do evidently and apparently carry two different Meanings. To give Money to a Man is one thing, and to give Money for a Man is quite another thing. To give, in like Manner, his Body to us, is quite a different thing from giving his Body for us.

Now the Difficulty is to know, what mean these Words ; to give his Body for us. We maintain that when Christ said : This is my Body which is given for you : His real Meaning was the same, as if he had said : This is my Body, which is sacrificed for you. St. Paul tells us so, plainly (and surely no Man better understood the Words of his divine Master, than that Holy Apostle) where he gives us the Words of the Institution of this great Action. 1 Cor. 11. 23. 24. The Lord Jesus the same Night in which he was betrayed, took Bread : And when he had given Thanks, he brake it and said, take, eat ; this is my Body which is broken for you. Again, Galat. 2. 20. I live by the Faith of the Son of

F

G O D,

G O D, who loved me and gave himself for me. And again: Ephes. 5. 2. *Walk in Love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an Offering and a Sacrifice to G O D.*

These sayings of St. Paul are too plain, to need any Comment to shew that the Words of Christ, when he said: *which is given for you*, could have no other Meaning, but this: *which is offered, or sacrificed for you*. And, indeed, all Antiquity from the very Beginning of Christianity, took them in this Sense: All the Ancient *Liturgies*, as I have made out in my Answer to your Grace's *Charitable Address*, expressly affirm it: All the ancient Fathers of the Church, both *Greek* and *Latin*, say the same thing in an Infinite Number of Places in their Works, as often as they had Occasion to speak of the Words of the Institution of Christ. In a Word, not only all the Catholics of the Church of G O D in all Ages to this Day; but even the very Schismatick *Greeks*, the *Nestorian* Hereticks, *Eutychians* and *Monothelites* have always understood those Words of Christ, so as by Virtue of the same Words to offer daily the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and to look upon it as the most August, and the most transcendent service they can exhibit to Almighty God.

All this, I think, I have sufficiently proved in my Answer to your Grace as aforesaid. So that I shall not trouble your Grace with any farther Proof upon this Head; but shall beg Leave to say, I am sorry to find you make so little Account of these

these sacred Monuments of Antiquity, the ancient Apostolical Liturgies, and of the Doctrine of the Holy Fathers, as to affirm, that the sayings both of the Liturgies and of the Fathers, are *Rhetorical Flights, Figurative, Tropical, or Hyperbolical Expressions.*

This Method, my Lord, of treating the *Liturgies* and the Holy Fathers, seems so very surprizing to me, that I think it well worth my while to vindicate their Authority.

Your Grace repeats the same thing in so many Places of your *Reply*, that it would be tedious to point at every one of them. I shall therefore pitch upon one or two, where your Grace seems to sum up the Evidence and shew Cause why you call them *Rhetorical Flights, &c.*

The first is, *Reply, Page 198. 199.* where your Grace hath these Words. " This Holy Sacrament being by G O D's own Appointment a *shewing, setting forth, or Representation of the Death of Christ* and the *Communion of his Body and Blood* (as I have just now observed) " it is no Wonder to find " some of the Ancient *Fathers*, in a Transport of Zeal and Piety, making use of " some *Rhetorical and Figurative Expressions,* " when they speak of it ; which in a *literal or dogmatical Sense*, were only to be understood of what was thereby *represented, shewn, or set forth*: And this more especially in their popular Discourses, and publick Offices, which were designed to raise the Devotion of the People, and for that Purpose, to keep their Thoughts some-
F 2 " times

“ times in Suspence between the *Sign* and
 “ the *thing Signified* ; and sometimes to re-
 “ present things to the *Imagination* beyond
 “ what they appear in *Reality* to have been,
 “ Their Design herein was no more but on-
 “ ly to make *Rhetorick* (as sometimes they
 endeavoured to make *Philosophy*) “ servicea-
 “ ble to Religion and Piety: But if they
 “ had foreseen the wrong Use that after-
 “ wards came to be made of some of their
 “ unguarded Expressions ; it is not to be
 “ doubted but that they would have been
 “ more cautious in them.

To treat any one of the Holy Fathers
 (much more many of them) after this Man-
 ner, seems to me (whatever your Grace
 may think of the Matter) very amazing.
 Did the Holy Fathers then in a *Transport of*
Zeal and Piety, make use of *Rhetorical* and
Figurative Expressions to deceive the People
 in their Homilies and Sermons, and teach
 them a Doctrine contrary to the Doctrine
 which Christ and his Apostles had taught
 them? Surely, this were not to guide them
 into the Path of Salvation ; but to lead them
 into Error and Perdition. And can this be
 affirmed of the great *Luminaries* of the
 Church of Christ?

The Holy Fathers, indeed, were great
 Masters of Eloquence, great Orators, and
 well skill'd in Rhetorick : But is it to be
 imagined they would use their Eloquence to
 delude the People with unguarded Expres-
 sions? Is not Eloquence and Oratory con-
 sistent with Truth and Sincerity? Is Truth
 delivered in a low creeping Style, more
 Amiable

Amiable than the same Truth delivered in a Florid eloquent one? No surely: For the Latter brightens Truth, and sets it off with more Lustre.

Did St. Cyprian, for Instance, use only a *Rhetorical Flight*, when he said: "Nam quis magis Sacerdos Dei summi quam Dominus Noster Jesus Christus, qui Sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit; et obtulit hoc idem quod Melchisedec obtulerat, id est Panem et Vinum, suum scilicet Corpus et sanguinem?" For what Priest of the most High God, is greater than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered a Sacrifice to G O D the Father; and even the same which Melchisedeck offered namely Bread and Wine, that is, his own Body and Blood?

Or St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, when he said: Then we pray for the deceased Fathers and Bishops: Lastly for all those that once lived with us, and are now departed; believing it to be a great Benefit unto their Souls for whom Prayer is made, whilst the Holy and Tremendous Sacrifice lies before us. Or St. Jerom, when he said: "Male ergo facit Romanus Episcopus, qui super Mortuorum Hominum Petri et Pauli ossa veneranda (secundum te Pulvisculum) offert Domino Sacrificia, et Tumulos eorum arbitratur Altaria, idque non solum unius Urbis, sed totius orbis faciunt Episcopi." It is ill done then of the Bishop of Rome, who over the venerable Bones (contemptible Dust according to you) of dead Men Peter and Paul offers Sacrifices unto the Lord, and supposes their Tombs to be Altars; and this is not only done

by the Bishop of one City, but also by the Bishops of the World. Or St. Ambrose, when he said: "Quando sacrificamus Christus adest, Christus immolatur; etenim Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus." *When we offer Sacrifice Christ is present, Christ is sacrificed; for our Passover is Christ sacrificed.* Or St. Austin, when he said: "Erat autem, ut nostis, Sacrificium Judæorum antea secundum Ordinem Aaron in victimis Pecorum; et hoc in Mysterio. Nondum erat Sacrificium Corporis et Sanguinis Domini, quod norunt Fideles, et qui Evangelium legerunt, quod sacrificium nunc diffusum est toto Orbe Terrarum." *There was, as ye know, first the Sacrifice of the Jews after the Order of Aaron, which consisted in Victims of Cattle, and that in a Mystery; the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of our Lord, which the Faithful know, and those who read the Gospel, was not then instituted, which Sacrifice is now spread over all the World.* Note that all these Passages are more at Large set down in the Sixth Chapter of my Answer to the Charitable Address.

I shall not trouble your Grace, or the Reader with any Remarks upon these Passages; but will leave your Grace, and those who will do me the Honour to read them, to judge whether or no they look like Rhetorical Flights? Or whether they are not the sincere Sentiments of their Hearts publishing and declaring to the World the Doctrine which they themselves had learned from their Predecessors, and would plant the same

same in the Hearts of the Faithful, whom they intended to instruct and edifie?

As to the ancient *Liturgies*, your Grace (Page 199.) desires the plain English Reader (for an Instance of what you say) only to read and consider the Quotation which I produce (Page 61.) out of the Liturgy of *St. Basil*. Then your Grace adds, "When our blessed Saviour was led forth to be crucified for the Sins of the World; a Multitude of Spectators (as it is usual in all like Cases) attended him to the Place of Execution. In Allusion hereunto, the Author of this *Liturgy* endeavours, in this holy Sacrament of which we are speaking, to *shew, set forth, or represent* the Death of Christ in the most glorious Manner, and to introduce the Archangels and Angels as Spectators of it." The Words, as you set them down, are these; "Let all Flesh be silent, and stand with Fear and Trembling, laying aside all earthly Thoughts: For the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, comes forth to be sacrificed, and given for Food to the Faithful; preceded by Choirs of Archangels, Principalities, and Powers, the many-eyed Cherubim, and six-winged Seraphim; who covering their Eyes, sing aloud Allelujab. Now this being plainly no more but a Rhetorical Allusion to the Circumstances of the Death of Christ; it cannot from hence be inferred, that *St. Basil* was of Opinion, that in this Holy Sacrament there is offered a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead; and much less that without the Be-

“ *lies of this, no Man can be saved ; or in-*
 “ *deed, that there was, or is any other*
 “ *true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice made*
 “ *of Christ, but that alone which was*
 “ *made upon the Cross.*

This is the Inference, which your Grace draws from the Words of the Liturgy. But I beg Leave to infer a Meaning very different from it ; which, in my Opinion, is plain from the very Words of the Liturgy : For the Liturgy doth not allude to Christ's Passion upon the Cross, but to Christ, as he was to be offered a Sacrifice upon the Altar ; which, I think, is evidently plain from these Words of the Liturgy : *For the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, comes forth to be sacrificed, and given for Food to the Faithful.* Whereas, if St. Basil had alluded to the Passion of Christ upon the Cross, he would not have said, *The King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, comes forth to be sacrificed, and given for Food to the Faithful ;* but the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, was formerly sacrificed on the Cross : Nor can the following Words, *and given for Food to the Faithful,* with any Propriety of Speech, allude to any other thing, but to the Body and Blood of Christ upon the Altar. And pray, my Lord, where is the Rhetorical Allusion or Flight, in saying that *Jesus Christ is the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords ;* or in saying, that he is preceded by Choirs of *Archangels, Principalities, and Powers, the many-eyed Cherubim, and six-winged Seraphim,* as if it were not natural for any Man, who is penetrated with a
 true

true Sense of the Grandure of Almighty G O D to say (as it is in Reality true) that he is *King of Kings*, and *Lord of Lords*, and is preceded by Choirs of *Archangels*, *Principalities*, and *Powers*, when he is supposed to come forth upon a solemn Occasion; it being natural to the very Princes of the Earth to be attended by their chief Ministers and Servants, when they proceed upon any solemn Ceremony.

Where then, my Lord, is the *Rhetorical Flight*, or *Tropical*, or *Hyperbolical* saying in affirming, that *Jesus Christ* is *King of Kings*, and *Lord of Lords*, or that he is preceded by Choirs of *Archangels*, *Principalities*, and *Powers*, &c. when he comes forth to be sacrificed on our Altars?

But this is not all: For tho' this Passage, in which your Grace instances, seems to carry some Difficulty; yet all the rest of the Passages cited by me out of the ancient *Liturgies* are so plain in the literal Sense, that it is impossible to wrest them, so as to be thought *Rhetorical Flights*, *Figurative*, or *Tropical Expressions*. For Instance, can this Passage in the *Liturgy* of St. *James*, be wrested to a *Figurative Expression*, or *Rhetorical Flight*; where it is said, that when the Priest had pronounced the Words of Consecration, he putteth up this Prayer to Almighty G O D, *We Sinners offer to thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice, beseeching thee not to deal with us after our Sins, nor reward us according to our Iniquities*? Or, in the *Liturgy* of St. *Mark*, where we read this Prayer, *Sanctify also, O G O D,*
this

this Sacrifice with thy heavenly Benediction, by the Descent of thine holy Spirit upon it?

Or even in the Liturgy of the Arch-Heretick, *Nestorius*; where the Priest addressing himself to GOD the Father, saith, *We offer to thee this lively, holy, acceptable, excellent, and unbloody Sacrifice, for all thy Creatures, and for thy Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church, which is spread over the Face of the whole Earth?* Or in the Liturgy of the Heretick, *Severus*; where, in like manner, we read this Prayer put up, after the Consecration, to *Jesus Christ* himself; *We therefore, O Lord Jesu, offer this unbloody Sacrifice, and implore thy Pity towards Mankind, which induced thee to give thy self a Sacrifice for us?* Here it is well worth our While to remark, that tho' these two Latter, who compiled these two Liturgies for their own Use, have left the Catholick Church upwards of Twelve Hundred Years since; yet carried away with them this Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, which is an evident Sign, that it was the Doctrine of the whole Catholick Church, before they separated from it.

Now whether, I say, these Passages here cited can admit of any Rhetorical Flit, or Figurative Expression, without the greatest Violence offered them, I leave your Grace, and the World to judge?

Your Grace tells me, Page 201. I own it does not appear that these ancient Liturgies were reduced to Writing until the Beginning of the fourth Century. Then your Grace adds, " And indeed it is most
" manifest

" manifest that they are of much later
 " Date even than that." You also say,
 Page 60. " That some *Words were undoubt-*
 " *edly added to, or inserted in those Litur-*
 " *gies*; which is a greater Diminution of
 " their pretended Authority." And if you
 really think, as Page 59. you seem to do,
 " That the Pastors of the Church used a tra-
 " ditionary Form, of those Liturgies, which
 " they had by Heart, all along before they
 " were put into Writing; you must excuse
 " me, if I cannot build my Faith and
 " Hope of Salvation upon such a ground-
 " less Fancy as this, for which you do not
 " so much as offer the least Shadow of
 " Proof. But when a Man perceives that
 " his Cause is *sinking*, it is no Wonder that
 " he endeavours to support it by every
 " *Twig or Bulrush* he can lay hold of.

As to the Time these Liturgies were re-
 duced to Writing, whether it was the pre-
 cise Time mentioned by me, or of a latter
 Date, as your Grace saith, it is not very
 material; since it is acknowledged by the
 Learned, that in the Main, they are the
 Forms used by the Apostles and Apostoli-
 cal Men from the Beginning. What your
 Grace subjoins, that you would not build
 your Faith and Hope of Salvation upon
 such a groundless Fancy, as *that the Pastors*
of the Church used a traditionary Form,
of those Liturgies, which they had by Heart,
 all along before they were put into Writing,
 seems to me very strange.

Pray,

Pray, my Lord, is your Grace of Opinion, that the Apostles and their immediate Successors, before the Doctrine contained in the New Testament was put into Writing, used no set Form of Words in the Administration of the Sacraments, in ordaining *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*; or in celebrating what we call *Mafs*, and your Grace, *the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ*? If so, how can we be assured that the Apostles and their Successors did ever rightly administer any of these Divine Offices? But if they did use a set Form, which could not be otherwise retained, but either by keeping it by them in Writing on Paper, or by having it by Heart, and which I call, I think, rightly, a *traditionary Form*; how your Grace can call this a groundless Fancy, I really do not understand. As to what your Grace adds, that my Cause is *sinking*. Not so fast, my Lord, may it please your Grace. It has withstood many violent Storms, and the Shocks and Efforts of many Enemies, now, almost Seventeen Hundred Years, without *sinking*. But I shall say no more on this Head, lest I should say what may not be expedient.

I had answered to an Objection, which your Grace borrow'd from *St. Paul, Heb. 9. 22. Without shedding of Blood there is no Remission of Sins*; and distinguishing, said, Without shedding of Blood, in a bloody or unbloody Manner, I grant, there is no Remission of Sins: Without shedding of Blood in a bloody Manner, there is no Remission; I must beg Leave to deny; and think

think it is plain, from the Words of the Institution of this *Sacrifice*, previous to that of the Cross, where *Jesus Christ* says, *This is my Body which is given for you: This is my Blood which is shed for you, for the Remission of Sins.* That his Blood was then shed only unbloodily and mystically, and not bloodily, as on the Cross, is manifest; and yet it was for the Remission of Sins: And by consequence there is Remission of Sins by the *mystical* and *unbloody Effusion* of the Blood of Christ, such as is made in the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Your Grace hereupon, after repeating twice or thrice with some Admiration, Reply, Page 203. the Words *unbloodily*, and *mystically*, and not *bloodily*; adds these Words, "Certainly, if there be any such thing as *Nonsense*, we have an egregious Instance of it here." Then your Grace proceeds: "To *shed Blood* is nothing else but to let it out of the Body. Is Christ's Blood then let out of his Body, every time that Mass is celebrated; Or is it possible to let Blood out of a Body in an unbloody Manner? If a Man should say that a thing is *White*, but not *whitely*, or in a white Manner; would not every one say he talked like a Madman? And what better Sense is it to say that *Blood is shed*, or let out of the Body; but not *bloodily*, not in a bloody Manner? It is a Reproach to Man's Understanding, to take Pains to confute such *Jargon* as this; but a greater Shame to your Church, to require

" all

" all Men, under Pain of no less than
" Damnation, to believe it.

I answer, my Lord, that when I make use of the Words *unbloody* and *mystical Effusion of the Blood of Christ* (which your Grace is pleased to term Nonsense and *Jargon*) I only borrow the Language of all Antiquity. There is nothing more frequently repeated by the ancient and apostolical *Liturgies*, when they speak of the Sacrifice of the *Altar*, than the Words *unbloody Sacrifice*; nor by the Holy Fathers and Ecclesiastical Writers, than the Words *Incruentum Sacrificium*.

When your Grace reasons upon these Divine Things, you seem to take your View only from the Things that are here on Earth; and to measure the profound Mysteries of GOD, by what usually happens in this World. This, I think, is plain from those very Words of your Grace: *Is it possible to let Blood out of a Body in an unbloody Manner?* But I humbly conceive, that Divine Things are not to be measured by the scant Line of what we see and perceive here below.

Pray, my Lord, is it *Nonsense* and *Jargon* to say, That a Human Body, that is *sown a Natural Body*, is *raised a Spiritual Body*? No one can deny the Being of a *Natural Body* and a *Spiritual Body*, without flatly contradicting St. Paul, 1 Cor. 15. And yet there is as much *Nonsense* and *Jargon* in this Expression, a *Spiritual Body*, as in this other, *unbloody Sacrifice*, *unbloody* or *mystical Effusion of Blood*; for as there are two very different

different Manners of Being proper to a Human Body, according to its different States (for it may be either corruptible, or incorruptible; mortal or immortal; natural or spiritual) so there are two very different Manners of Being proper to Jesus Christ in the Sacrifice of the Altar, and in that of the Cross; in that of the Cross, He was corruptible and mortal; on the Altar, he is immortal and incorruptible: And as the Body of Christ, in the Eucharist, is not in its corruptible, mortal and usual Manner of Being, but as it is incorruptible, immortal and a spiritual Body; so the Sacrifice is unbloody, and the Effusion of his Blood is mystical or unbloody also, proportionable to his spiritual Manner of Being there; for as, when the Body of Jesus Christ was in its corruptible, mortal and usual Manner of Being, upon the Cross, his Blood was after the usual Manner, that is, bloodily shed: So when this same Body has put on its other more perfect Manner of Being, and is now become Incorruptible, Immortal, and even Spiritual, his Blood is, and can be no otherwise shed than mystically and unbloodily.

It is no small Comfort to me, my Lord, that these Expressions, *unbloody Sacrifice, unbloody and mystical Effusion of the Blood of Christ* on Christian Altars (which your Grace makes so very free with, as to term them *Nonsense* and *Jargon*, and which you say is a Reproach to your Understanding to take Pains to confute) are the express Language of all Antiquity. We read in the
Eighth

Eighth Book of the Apostolical Constitutions a Form, or Manner of consecrating Bishops and Priests, in which is expressed a Power to offer *unbloody Sacrifice*. In all ancient Liturgies, or Books of publick Church-Service, it is expressed, that *unbloody Sacrifice* is offered on Christian Altars. And as for the Holy Fathers, it would be an endless Work to copy over the several Passages in their Works, in which they unanimously agree in making use of this Expression, *unbloody Sacrifice*: However, I think proper to transcribe a few, which I make Choice of chiefly for the Brevity of the Quotations.

Eusebius Casariensis, Bishop and Father of the fourth Century, in the Tenth Chapter of his First Book, *De Evangel. Demonstra.* calls the Sacrifice of the New Law an *unbloody Sacrifice*; saying, *We are taught by the most high Priest of All to offer unto the Supreme GOD, throughout our whole Life, unbloody and reasonable Victims sweet unto Him.*

St. Gregory Nazienzen, in his First Oration against *Julian* the Apostate, shewing the Aversion this wretched Emperor had to the Sacrifice of the Altar, saith, *He profaned his Hands, that he might wash them from the unbloody Sacrifice, by which we communicate Christ and his Sufferings, and Divinity.*

St. Cyrillus Alexandrinus, in *Declara. Anathematismi* 11. saith, *We offer the holy, quickning and unbloody Sacrifice in the Church, believing the Body and precious Blood which is set before us, to be not of common Man, and*
like

like unto us, but of the Word. And in his Book, *De Adorat. in Spiritu*, Lib. 13. The Table truly of Proposition, having Bread upon it, did signify our unbloody Host, wherewith we all are Blessed, whilst we eat that Bread which is from Heaven, that is to say, Christ. Surely, some People will call this Nonsense and Fargon with a Witness.

That our Saviour, at his last Supper, instituted an unbloody Sacrifice was a thing so generally received, and universally believ'd by the whole primitive Church, that of the Four first General Councils which were held in the Church of Christ, two call the Eucharist the unbloody Sacrifice. The Council of Nice, which was the First, saith, *Let us understand the Lamb of GOD, which taketh away the Sins of the World, to be placed upon that Table, sacrificed after an unbloody Manner by Priests.*

St. Cyril, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, who presided in the Pope's Name at the General Council of *Ephesus*, in the Twenty Sixth Epistle, recorded in the First Part of the said Council, writeth after this manner unto *Nestorius* the Heretick, for whose Condemnation the Council was called, saying, *I cannot omit this, that whilst we declare the Death of the only Son of GOD, and his Resurrection from Death, we also confess his Assumption into Heaven, and celebrate the unbloody Sacrifice in the Church, and approach unto the Mystical Blessings, by which we are sanctified, as being made Partakers of the Holy Flesh and Precious Blood of Christ, the Saviour of us All; neither do we receive it as common*

Flesh (G O D forbid) nor yet as the Flesh of a holy Man, but we receive it, as it truly is, the quickening, and life-giving Flesh of the Word it self.

Indeed, if there was Question of sacrificing a Bull, Ram, or Lamb; to let Blood out of their Bodies, and to say it was in an unbloody Manner, would be emphatically *Nonsense* and *Jargon*: But to reason after the same Manner, upon the Effusion of Christ's Blood on the Altar, is to destroy all Mysteries of Faith, and to reduce them to the Standard of the short Line of Human Understanding. For may not any Man, who should take his Measures from the things we are conversant about in this World, say, that it is *Nonsense* and *Jargon* to say, that in the Mystery of the Trinity, tho' the Father is G O D, and perfect G O D, the Son is G O D, and perfect G O D, the Holy Ghost is G O D, and perfect G O D, and each of them really distinct one from the other; yet that there is but one G O D? But of this enough.

As to the Rest of your Grace's Objections upon this Head, I shall pass them by, because they roll upon the Foot (like this) of Human Reason, and proceed



T O T H E
SEVENTH CHAPTER.

HERE, my Lord, I must have written a large Volume, should I answer all your Grace's Objections, Questions and Demands upon the Subject of the *real Presence* and *Transubstantiation*. These have been often answered by very able and godly Divines: *Costerus* answered many of them: *Belarmine*, more; *St. Thomas Aquinas*, most of all; besides, hundreds of other learned Divines have written large Treatises in answer to your Grace's Objections, and to many others. Yet still these Objections and Questions must be brought upon the *Tapae*; whereas if Men had only in View to seek the naked Truth, it is the Answer to these Objections and Questions that ought to be attacked, and their Weakness or Insufficiency expos'd, in case there was any, and not to serve us up always the same Mefs.

I shall therefore pass them by in Silence; and beg leave to observe only three things, in this long Chapter, which, I think, are new and of a very extraordinary Nature.

The first is, your Grace's Explanation of the *real Presence* of Christ's Body in the *Eucharist*.

The second, what your Grace affirms, and a certain anonymous Author, whom your Grace recommends to me, of the Impossibility of *Transubstantiation* in the *Sacrament*.

The third, the Reflection which your Grace makes upon the Prayer call'd the *Invocation of the Holy Ghost*, in the ancient *Liturgies* of the *Oriental Churches*.

To begin with the first. Your Grace explains the *real Presence*, after this Manner: *Reply*, Page 210. " The word *Presence*, in
" it's original Signification is a *relative*
" *Term*, and always denotes a Reference to
" the *Senses* of the Person, to whom the
" thing, spoken of, is supposed to be pre-
" sent. Thus, when I plainly see a *Thing*,
" although at some Distance, such a thing is
" said to be *present to my Sight* : But if it be
" so near as that I can also touch, taste, and
" smell it, and hear the sound of it, it is tru-
" ly and properly said to be present to all
" my Senses. Now in this Signification of
" the Word, it is not pretended by you
" that Christ is *present* in the Holy Sacra-
" ment, where you neither see, touch, taste,
" smell, or hear him. You all own that he
" is not there present to the Senses.
" From this *original Signification* of the
" Word, another, not unlike it, is deduced :
" And if I have as clear and distinct a
" Knowledge and Remembrance of a thing,
" as if it were *present to my Senses* ; such a
" thing

“ thing is usually said to be *present* to my
 “ *Thoughts*, to my *Understanding*, to my *Me-*
 “ *memory*.

“ In like Manner, altho’ no Know-
 “ ledge of a thing is conveyed to me by my
 “ *Senses*, nor is it the Object of my *natural*
 “ *Understanding*; yet if God has made it
 “ known, and I believe it, that same thing
 “ is *present* to my *Faith*. God has not *exhi-*
 “ *bited*, *presented* or *represented* it to my Sen-
 “ *ses*, or to my *natural Reason* (and there-
 “ fore to *them* it is not *present*) but to my
 “ *Faith*; and if I believe it, it is as truly
 “ present to my *Faith* as other Objects are
 “ to my *natural Faculties*. If my Belief of
 “ such a thing were only upon some
 “ groundless *Fancy* of my own, the *Pre-*
 “ *sence* of it to *me* would be only imaginary:
 “ But if God has made it known, and I up-
 “ on good Grounds believe it; the *Presence*
 “ of it to my *Faith*, is not an *Imaginary*, but
 “ a *real Presence*.

“ The Introduction of these Words (*real*
 “ *Presence*) has occasioned much unnecessa-
 “ ry Disputations among Divines. For in
 “ a spiritual (which here is the only profi-
 “ table) Sense, we all agree that in the Holy
 “ Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, Jesus
 “ Christ is *really present* to the *Faith* of every
 “ worthy Receiver. The Bread and Wine
 “ only are present to our Senses. But this
 “ Holy Sacrament being by *G O D’s own*
 “ *Appointment*, a *shewing*, *setting forth*, or
 “ representing of *Christ’s Death*, and the
 “ *Communion of his Body and Blood*, or the
 “ Means whereby the Benefits of that Sa-
 “ crifice,

“ crifice, which he made of himself for us;
 “ are *communicated* to us ; this same *Sacri-*
 “ *fice* of Christ crucified, is therein *really*
 “ and truly, but always spiritually and not
 “ corporally exhibited, represented or made
 “ *present* to our *Faith*, as being the Object
 “ of it : And in this Sense the *Body* and
 “ *Blood* of Christ are verily and indeed (and
 “ not in Imagination only) apprehended,
 “ laid hold of *taken and received* by the
 “ *Faithful* in the *Lord’s Supper* (as our *Church*
 “ *Catechism* speaks) but the wicked and un-
 “ worthy Person, who comes not with a
 “ sincere Faith (however *weak* such a Faith
 “ may possibly be) may indeed swallow
 “ down the Bread and Wine ; but *he eateth*
 “ *and drinketh Judgment* or *Condemnation*
 “ *to himself* not *discerning the Lord’s Body*,”
 1 Cor. 11. 29.

Thus much your Grace upon the *real*
Presence : To which I beg Leave to offer a
 few Exceptions.

In the first Place, I humbly conceive,
 your Grace has not given an adequate Noti-
 on of the word *Presence*. You say, the word
Presence, in it’s original Signification, is a
relative Term, and always denotes a *Reference*
to the Senses of the Person, to whom the thing,
spoken of, is supposed to be present.

This, I think, my Lord, cannot be true
 in many Circumstances : For the *Presence*
 of things, or things present, do not always
 affect any of our *Senses*. For Instance, when
 I enter into a dark Room, well furnished, I
 am in the *Presence* of many things, or many
 things are *present* to me, which I neither see,
 feel,

feel, hear, touch or taste. Again, the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ was in the Presence of his Disciples, as often as he was among them, or was present to them; and yet his Divinity could not affect any of their *Senses*, nor have any Reference to them: And therefore your Grace's Notion of the word *Presence* is not very just, when you say, it always denotes a Reference to our Senses. Had your Grace said, the word *Presence* always denotes a Reference to the Belief or Faith of things, which our *Senses* suggest to us, I would readily concur with you: Because Faith is by Hearing, *Fides ex auditu*, and Hearing is one of our *Senses*; so that when we believe the *real Presence* of Christ's Body and Blood upon the Word of God, conveyed to us by Hearing, it is not upon the Testimony of our *Senses*, which seem to suggest the contrary to us, that we believe it, but upon GOD's own Word, and consequently the *real Presence* and all other *Presences* do not always denote a Reference to the *Senses*, but rather to the Belief or Faith of the Things which we learn by Hearing.

Secondly, Your Grace saith, *If I have as clear and distinct a Knowledge and Remembrance of a thing as if it were present to my Senses; such a thing is usually said to be present to my Thoughts, to my Understanding, to my Memory.*

This, my Lord, I take to be liable to greater Exceptions than the former: For the things, of which a Man hath a distinct Knowledge and Remembrance (when the

said things are absent) cannot be present to his Thoughts, or Understanding, or Memory, otherwise than in the Idea or Notion which he frames in his Mind of them; and which, surely, is not to have the things themselves present, when they are supposed to be absent. In a Word, he has only an *Ideal Presence* of those absent things; such as all Mankind form in their Minds, when they are either told things they did not know before, or reflect upon things which they had both seen and heard, but are not present either to their Senses or Understanding. For Instance, I my self was thoroughly acquainted with a certain Gentleman in my Neighbourhood, who is now dead and laid in his Grave: I can form to my Self, in my Mind, an Idea or Notion of his Body and Mind. But surely your Grace will not say that this Idea or Notion doth render the said Gentleman really present to me, when I am sure that he is absent and laid in his Tomb. Of this Kind, I might give a thousand Instances more.

Thirdly, I beg leave to observe, that this wrong Notion (*absit Injuria Verbo*) which your Grace hath of a *real Presence*, is the Foundation upon which you build what your Grace calls a *real Presence* of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament by Faith: For you only Substitute the Revelation of Jesus Christ to form your Faith upon, with Respect to the Sacrament, in the Room of what your Senses exhibited to you, with Respect to other things: And as you can have no other than an ideal or notional

Presence

Presence of things absent, which you once perceived with your Senses: In like Manner the Belief or Faith you have upon the Testimony of Jesus Christ of the *Presence* of his Body and Blood, which your Grace says are only in Heaven, can be no other than an ideal or notional *Presence* in your Mind; but not a *real Presence* of his Body and Blood in the Sacrament.

Fourthly, I must observe, that your Grace's Doctrine, as I take it, is very different from the Doctrine of the Church of *England* in the Days of King JAMES the First. This appears manifestly by the Answer which Bishop *Andrews*, by order of the said King JAMES, made in the Name of the whole Church of *England* to Cardinal *Belarmine's* Apology. His Words are these:

“ Nobis vobiscum de objecto convenit, de modo Lis est. Præsentiam, inquam, credimus, non minus quam vos, veram; de modo Præsentiae nil temerè definimus.”

We agree with you concerning the Object, the Strife is about the Manner of it. We believe, I say, a true Presence no less than you (or as much as you) we define nothing rashly concerning the Manner of the Presence. Bishop *Mountain*, Bishop *Bilson*, Arch-Bishop *Land*, Bishop *Morton*, Bishop *Forbes*, Bishop *Ken*, and many other learned Divines of the Church of *England*, whose Works are extant, believed the *real Presence* of Christ's Body and Blood in the *Eucharist*, as much as the *Roman Catholics* do.

Now,

Now it is certain, all *Roman Catholicks* believe the real and true Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the *Eucharist* after the Consecration, not only by Faith, as your Grace affirms, but also in Truth and Reality, and independently of any Man's Belief; and as such adore this real Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity with true *Latria*, his Divinity, for as much as he is a Divine Person, and his Humanity, by reason of the Hypostatical Union of his Divinity to his Humanity; as the Bishops and Divines of the Church of England in King JAMES I.'s Time, and for a great many Years after, believed and practised. So that your Grace's Doctrine of the *real Presence*, by Faith only, is, I think, new and unheard of, in the Church of England, till of Late.

In my Answer to your Grace's *Charitable Address*, upon this Chapter, I quoted many of those Bishops of the Church of England, and cited some of their Passages, wherein they express the *real Presence* of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, and the Adoration of true *Latria* to be given to him, in as full and strong Terms as any *Roman Catholick* Bishop or Divine could express it: But your Grace was pleased to pass them by in Silence and take no Notice of them.

Thus much concerning the *real Presence*. I shall now proceed to the Second thing, *viz.* What your Grace and the *Anonymous* Author, whom you recommend to me, say of the Impossibility of *Transubstantiation*.

Your

Your Grace, indeed, does not carry the Matter so high as this Author doth ; So that if I answer his Objections, which he pushes farther than any Writer I have ever yet met with ; I hope, I may be dispensed with, if I do not answer your Grace's Objections which are, indeed, more modest and plausible.

I own, my Lord, I never heard of the Man, nor of his Book, till I read your Grace's Reply upon this Chapter. Nor, if I had heard of him, or read his Book, wou'd I take the Trouble to answer a Book with so pompous a Title, as, *The absolute Impossibility of Transubstantiation demonstrated*, had not your Grace recommended him to me ; being persuaded that to undertake to demonstrate the Impossibility of a Mystery of Faith held and believed by all the Catholick Church of the *East* and *West* in all Ages, till the Days of *Berengarius*, who was but one, must needs be an extravagant *Rhadamontado* of a Man, whose Brain was not in it's right Situation ; according to that excellent Rule of St. *Austin* before cited : " Si quid horum tota per Orbem frequentat Ecclesia. Nam et hinc quin ita faciendum sit, disputare, insolentissima Insania est." To dispute what the universal Church believeth, is a most insolent Madness.

However, since your Grace recommended him to me, I took some Pains to examine his Demonstration, and do find upon the whole (after all his Bustle and Noise) that the Moral of the Fable may be justly applied to him : *Parturiunt Montes nascetur ridiculus Mus.*

Mus. For he does not seem to know the Principles of Logick, nor wherein a Contradiction consists. In order then to examine his first Demonstration (for I will not follow him in the Rest of his wild Notions) I shall here premise some reasonable Propositions or Demands, which I hope your Grace will not refuse to allow.

First, That *G O D* can do every Thing, which doth not imply a Contradiction.

Secondly, That a Contradiction is, to affirm and deny the same thing of the same thing, according to the same thing : Or, as it is more expressly in the Latin : *Contradictio est affirmatio et negatio ejusdem de eodem Secundum Idem.*

Thirdly, Hence it follows, that to say *James* is in *Dublin*, *James* is not in *Dublin*, is a Contradiction. To say, *James* is white in the Face, *James* is not white in the Face, is also a Contradiction : Because in both these Cases, the same thing is affirm'd and denied of the same *James*, and according to the same Thing. But to say, *James* is white and *James* is black, is not a Contradiction ; because he may be white in some part of his Body, as in the Face, and black in another part, as in the Head ; for altho' the same thing be affirmed and denied of *James* in this Case ; yet because it is not affirmed, according to the same thing, it is not a Contradiction, but is only equivalent to these two Propositions : *James* is white in the Face, *James* is not white in the Head, which surely is no Contradiction.

In

In like Manner to say, that *James* is in *Dublin*, and to say that the same *James* is in *Finglafs*, is not a Contradiction; because it does not affirm and deny the same thing of *James*, according to the same thing, but according to different Things, viz. *Dublin* and *Finglafs*.

And here I beg Leave to ask your Grace, whether G O D might not create *James* in *Finglafs*, tho' he had not been in *Dublin*, or extant before? And if so, why may not G O D, by his omnipotent Power, reproduce him in *Finglafs*, tho' he had been at the same Time in *Dublin*; since so doing does not imply a Contradiction? Is it harder to reproduce a Person in being, and give him the same Numerical Nature and Substance, than to create all Men of Nothing? Or (*sic licet exemplis in parvo Grandibus uti*) for God the Father, who is Prior to his Son, not indeed by a Priority of Time or Nature; but by a Priority of Origine, to beget a Person, of the same Numerical Nature and Substance with himself? Really, whoever thinks it is, does not entertain Sentiments of Almighty G O D suitable to his infinite Power and Grandure.

Fourthly, Bodies (upon the present Debate) may be considered in two different States, either as they are cloathed with external Quantity or Extension, in order to place here in this Life, or as they shall be upon the Resurrection. Of the latter, St. Paul, 1 Cor. 15. 42, 43, 44. speaketh thus:
 “ Seminatur in Corruptione, surget in Incorruptione: Seminatur in Ignobilitate, surget
 “ get

“ get in Gloria : Seminatur in Infirmirate;
 “ surget in Virtute : Seminatur Corpus Ani-
 “ male, surget Corpus Spiritale.” *It is*
sown in Corruption, it shall rise in Incorruption:
It is sown in Dishonour, it shall rise in Glory :
It is sown in Weakness, it shall rise in Power :
It is sown a natural Body, it shall rise a spiri-
tual Body.

Hence it is plain, that the State of human Bodies are very different, after the Resurrection, from what they were before the same : That is, they have then the Qualities and Endowments of Spirits and are therefore called by St. Paul, glorified or spiritual Bodies. Now the natural Qualities or Endowments of Spirits, as Angels or rational Souls, is to have no Extension of Parts or Quantity, but to be whole, in the whole Place where they are, and whole in every Part of the Place where ever they are said to be. Tho', strictly speaking, no Spirit, nor even God Almighty himself, nor an Angel, nor a rational Soul, are in any Place after the Manner we conceive Bodies to be in a Place : For to be in a Place, strictly speaking, is to have the Parts of the thing contained, correspond with the different Parts of the Place containing : And as neither GOD Almighty, nor an Angel, nor a rational Soul, have any actual Parts corresponding to the different Parts of Place ; so they cannot, strictly speaking, be said to be in any Place. When we say then, that GOD is every where, that an Angel is in the Church, that a rational Soul is in a human Body, and that the Body and Blood of Christ

Christ are in the Host and in the Chalice after the Consecration, we only speak after the manner of Men, in order to be understood, and to conform our Ideas to the Things wherewith we are daily conversant here on Earth.

Thus much premised : Let us now examine the Author's Demonstration.

He tells us, that Quantity, or Extension, is an essential Property of a Body ; but does not tell us, whether he means *actual*, or *potential* Extension ; or whether it be (to speak philosophically) *in Ordine ad se, vel in Ordine ad Locum*. For Exigence to an Extension is only essential to Quantity, but not the Extension it self, of which the Quantity is miraculously depriv'd in the Sacrament.

If he means, that actual or external Quantity, is an essential Property of a Body, he is very much out. For if it were so, take away an essential Property, or Part of any Thing, and you destroy the Whole.

Take away the Soul from the Body, or the Body from the Soul, and you destroy the whole Man.

Now it is certain, that the Body of Christ had not, upon several Occasions, both before and after his Resurrection, an actual or external Quantity or Extension, and yet was not destroyed. Blessed Mary the Mother of Christ was a Virgin as well after his Birth as before it : But a Virgin, after his Birth, she could not be, had he come from her Womb like other Children,
with

with a Body extended with its actual Quantity. And therefore was miraculously born without an actual or external Quantity. St. Luke the Evangelist, Chap. 4. 29. saith, *That when the Jews led Christ to the Brow of the Hill (whereon their City was built) that they might cast him down headlong, he passing through the midst of them went his way.* And St. John the Evangelist, Chap. 8. 59. saith, *The Jews took up Stones to cast at Jesus: But Jesus hid himself, and went out of the Temple, going through the midst of them.*

Now, I think, it is evident, that, upon both these Occasions, Christ's Escape was Miraculous; and that we cannot otherwise account for his passing through the midst of the Multitude unseen or unperceived, than by saying he strip'd himself of his actual or external Quantity, by Means whereof he was neither seen nor felt. And again, — Jesus arose and went out of the Sepulchre, which was shut with a great Stone, closed and sealed, which could not be done had he still retained his actual or external Quantity. Now, that he did, thus miraculously go out of the Sepulchre, is plain from the Words of St. Matthew, Chap. 28. 2. who tells us, that when *Mary Magdalen*, and the other *Mary*, came to see the Sepulchre, the *Angel of the Lord descended from Heaven*, and came and rolled back the Stone from the Door, and sate upon it.

After Christ's Resurrection, St. John the Evangelist, Chap. 20. 19, 26. tells us, that Jesus appeared before his Disciples twice,
the

the Doors being shut. Now the adding of these Words, *the Doors being shut* each time, denotes that Christ's Entrance into the Room was Miraculous, and consequently that he did then strip himself of his actual Quantity, which he immediately after resumed, when he bid his Disciples *feel and see*, &c. And again, St. Luke, Chap. 24. relating the Passage of the two Disciples going to *Emaus*, saith, that when these two knew him, he vanished out of their Sight. But, surely, this cannot be said, with any Propriety of Speech, that he went out of the Door of the Room before their Eyes; but, that as he sat down with them at the Table, he immediately vanished, or disappeared, which could not be done but by stripping himself in like manner of his actual or external Quantity. So that it is evident, Christ had a true and real Body, stripped of its actual or *external Quantity* upon several Occasions, both before and after his Resurrection; and by consequence, Actual Quantity or Extension, is not an essential Property of Body.

This is his first Mistake. The next is his pretended Demonstration; which (that he may not think I would lessen the Strength of it) I will give in his own Words, Page 3. where he saith, "The first
"and most obvious Contradictions in it
"are those which follow upon asserting,
"that the self same Body is in Heaven and
"Earth, and upon innumerable far distant
"Altars at once.



“ For let A, B, C, be so many different
 “ and far distant Places, and let D. be the
 “ same Body in those distant Places, and
 “ then you may behold those manifest Con-
 “ tradictions. First, D is in A, and D is not
 “ in A, for it is in B, which is not in A.
 “ Again, D is wholly in B, and D is wholly
 “ out of B, for it is in C, which is wholly
 “ out of B. And thus you may ring Chan-
 “ ges to endless Contradictions ; for still as
 “ you multiply these Places, the Contradi-
 “ ctions will all along encrease and multi-
 “ ply upon you till they come to exceed
 “ Millions of Millions.”

Rarely added *Millions of Millions* ! This
 is speaking home and to the purpose. Well
 but how does he prove all this ? Why, he
 draws a Scheme, or rather casts a Figure
 like a Conjuror ; and, I think, he had no
 less than Need of something of that black
 Art to conjure his Letters A, B, C, D, into
 a Contradiction, or Demonstration. He says,
 “ Let A, B, C, be so many different and far
 “ distant Places and let D be the same
 “ Body in those distant Places. and then
 “ you may behold these manifest Contra-
 “ dictions. First D is in A, and D is not in
 “ A, for it is in B. which is not in A. Again
 “ D is wholly in B, and D is wholly out of
 “ B, for it is in C, which is wholly out of
 “ B, &c.”

"B, &c." This is begging the Question; *Petitio principij*, as the Schools speak; The Question is, whether, supposing D to be in A, and at the same Time to be in B, implies a Contradiction; and to prove this, he only tells us, it is not in A, because it is in B, which is the thing in Question. Is not this bringing in Proof the very Thing that is to be proved, or is the Question? *Away with such a Demonstration!* I had premised before what all Philosophers allow, that a Contradiction is, *affirmatio et Negatio ejusdem de eodem secundum idem*; but this Gentleman's Contradiction (as he calls it) is, *affirmatio et negatio ejusdem de eodem secundum Diversum*. For he affirms of D, that it is in A, and denies of D that it is in A, not *secundum idem A*, but *secundum B*, which is *Diversum* from A. If this his Demonstration was good, it would prove that G O D Almighty could not be in two different Places at the same time. For may not the same Argument be made against G O D's being (for Instance) at the same time in *Dublin*, and in *Galway*? G O D is in *Dublin*, and is not in *Dublin*, for he is in *Galway* which is not in *Dublin*, *ergo*, &c. Who would not laugh at such a pretended Demonstration? Ay, but the Gentleman might say: G O D is in all Places. What then? Does his being in all Places, hinder him the more or less to be in *Dublin* and in *Galway* at the same time? G O D cannot do that which implies a Contradiction, and therefore he could not be in *Dublin* and in *Galway* at the same time, if it implied a Contradiction, that a real Being should be

in two or more different Places at the same time.

We may reason after the same Manner about a rational Soul or the Body of Christ in the Sacrament, as being a glorified spiritual Body, that is, as having the Qualities of a Spirit; so as to be whole in the Host, and whole in every Part of the Host, as the Soul is whole in the whole Body, and whole in every Part of the Body; and say: My Soul is whole in my Head, my Soul is whole at the same time, in my Foot: And then the pretended Demonstration or Contradiction would run thus: My Soul is whole in my Head, and is not whole in my Head, for it is whole in my Foot, which is not in my Head; but in a Place different from it. *Resum teatulis Amici?* In like manner, we may reason concerning the Soul's being above and under it self, be *East, West, North, and South* of it self, which the Gentleman looks upon, and reckons, as one of the greatest Absurdities: For, is not my Soul all in my Head, and all in my Feet, which is to be above and under it self. When I stand up, all in my right Hand, and all in my left, all in my Breast, and all in my Back; which is to be *East, West, North, and South* of it self; when I set my self in a certain Position. May not we also reason after the same Manner of the glorified Body of Christ in the Sacrament, which is there after the Manner of a Spirit, that is, whole in the Host, and whole in every Part of the Host? And if it can be whole in two different Parts or Places of the Host, at the same time,

time, why may not it be, by the Omnipotent Power of G O D, in ten Thousand different Places; since being in so many different Places does no more imply a Contradiction than it's being in two different Places at once; or of G O D's being at once, in *Dublin* and *Galway*, or of my Soul's being at the same time in my Head and in my Foot?

Thus much concerning the Author's first Demonstration. I shall not pursue him in the Rest: For being all grounded upon the same general Mistake of the Nature of a true Contradiction, they fall with the first.

I should therefore here take my Leave of him, but that he insists upon the general Topick of most of the Polemick Writers, our Antagonists, viz. That *Transubstantiation* destroys the Means of believing the Miracles of Christ, upon which our Faith is grounded. Christ appealed (say these Writers) to the Senses of his Disciples: See, and feel my Hands and Feet: Take away then (say they) the Evidence of our Senses, we cannot be sure that Christ wrought any Miracles, or that he rose from the Dead.

Tho' this be a thread bare Objection, which hath been answered an hundred Times; Yet for as much as it is still insisted upon, I shall bestow some Pains to shew how insignificant it is.

How often must these Gentlemen be told, that in the Business of *Transubstantiation*, we do not take away the Evidence of our Senses? For our Senses can only bear Witness of what is their proper Object in

the Sacrament, viz. the *Colour*, the *Figure*, the *Taste*, and the *Smell*, which we acknowledge to remain after Consecration.

Ay but (say they) wherever the *Figure*, the *Colour*, the *Taste*, and the *Smell* of any thing are preceptible to our Senses, there we must believe the very thing it self to be which is cloathed with these Appearances.

That is true, except we have a greater Assurance, viz. The Word of GOD, than that which our Senses can afford us, that the Matter is otherwise.

Now this is plainly the Case. We are assured by the Word of GOD, by the Catholick Church, to whom the Word of God and the Interpretation thereof was intrusted; by the Ancient Liturgies, and by the Holy Fathers, as I have proved at large in my *Answer to the Charitable Address*, that after Consecration, the real Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are in the Sacrament of the Altar; and therefore we ought to believe his divine Word, notwithstanding what our Senses should suggest to the Contrary. But how this single Instance, for which we have the express word of GOD, should take away the Means of believing the Miracles of Christ, which are an appeal to the Senses, I do not understand; since the Word of GOD doth no where interpose to invalidate the Testimony of our Senses, in any of the Miracles which Christ wrought to confirm the Truth of his Doctrine, and which we could not perceive without the Help of our Senses, upon which we may always safely rely, when

when the Authority of G O D's Word doth not interpose.

I should be glad to see those Gentlemen exert their Talents in disproving the many Instances in the Scripture, in which the Word of God tells us we are not to rely upon the Testimony of our Senses.

The Word of G O D *Genesis* Chap. 19. tells us, that two Angels in the Shape of Men came to *Sodom*; that *Lot* intreated, and, in a Manner, constrained them to come to his House; that he spoke to them, and they to him; that they went into the House, and, as far as he could perceive, did eat with him: That when the Men of *Sodom* came with a Design to abuse them as thinking them to be Men, and *Lot* went out to expostulate with the *Sodomites* and shut the Door after him; the Angels put forth their Hands and pulled *Lot* into the House.

Here is an Instance, in which we plainly see, that if we rely upon the Testimony of our Senses we should never believe those two, who came with *Lot* to his House, were any thing else but Men. *Lot*, with his Eyes, saw them have the Shape and Figure of Men, heard them with his Ears speak like Men, saw them eat like Men, and felt their Hands when they pulled him in: So that here were all the Testimonies of our Senses, and even of our Reason requisite to conclude that they were real Men; and yet the Word of G O D tells us they were not Men but Angels, who assumed the outward Appearances of Men without which they could not be seen or perceived.

Will any Christian then, who believes in G O D, and in his Holy Word affirm, that these two, who came to *Lot's House*, and gave so many Marks of human Nature, were Men, when the Word of G O D says they were not, but Angels?

To omit many more Instances, in the old Testament, as fully and as much to this purpose, as the former, of Angels appearing in the Shape of Men, speaking to Men, and touching them with their Hands. And to avoid being tedious, I shall instance in only two or three Examples in the New Testament. *St. John the Evangelist*, Chap. 1. tells us: That *St. John the Baptist* saw the *Holy Ghost* descending from Heaven like a Dove, and remaining upon *Christ*. Here we see the *Holy Ghost* assume the Figure and the Appearance of a Dove: But, surely, the *Holy Ghost* is not a real Dove, tho' it was then cloathed with the Appearance of a Dove. Here is then another Instance, in which *St. John the Baptist* did not, wou'd — not rely upon the Testimony of his Eyes.

John Chap. 20. *Mary Magdalen* saw two Angels in white sitting, one at the Head and the other at the Feet, where the Body of *Jesus* had lain, who said unto her: *Woman, why weepest thou?* *Mary Magdalen* had then the Testimony of her Eyes and Ears to conclude that the two she had seen were Men; and yet the Word of G O D tells us they were not Men but Angels.

We read in the *Acts of the Apostles* Chap. 12. That *St. Peter* being in Prison, an Angel came to him, filled the Prison with Light,

Imote

smote Peter on the side and raised him up, saying, *Arise up quickly.* Here St. Peter had the Evidence of three of his Senses, viz. *Seeing, Feeling, and Hearing,* that the Person who came to deliver him was a real Man, yet the Word of GOD tells us he was not a Man but an Angel.

Now, if in all these Instances, and in many more which might be brought, we do not rely upon the Evidence or Testimony of our Senses because the Word of GOD interposes; why may not we, in like Manner, reject the Evidence of our Senses, and believe that the real Body and Blood of Christ are in the Sacrament, since the Word of GOD expressly declares that they are? *The Bread that I will give you is my Flesh.* John Chap. 6. 51. *Christ took Bread, and gave Thanks and brake it and gave unto them, saying: This is my Body which is given for you: This do in Remembrance of me.* Likewise also the Cup, after Supper, saying, *this Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you,* Luke 22. 19, 20.

May not we then rely upon the Word of God, and believe that the real Body and Blood of Christ is in the Sacrament, cloathed with the Appearance only of Bread and Wine, notwithstanding any thing that our Senses suggest to the Contrary; as well as the Holy Men and Women of old, believed upon the Word of GOD, that those whom they saw, in the Appearance of Men, were not Men but Angels? And if so: Then follows the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*: Then follows also that the Body and Blood,
Soul

Soul and Divinity of our Lord *Jesus Christ* are contain'd in the Sacrament: For he is true G O D and true M A N, is not divided nor dieth any more, "*Christus jam non moritur.*" *Christ dieth no more* Rom. 6 9. and therefore wherever his Body and Blood are, there his Soul and Divinity are also. Besides if our Adversaries Argument be good, it will, by Parity of Reason, destroy the *Mystery* of the *Trinity*; and make way for the Victory and Triumph of our modern *Arians* the *Socinians*. These subtle Hereticks tell us, that as *Transubstantiation* is repugnant to our Senses, so the *Mystery* of the *Trinity* is to our Reason and Understanding, and subverts almost all Mathematical Demonstrations: For as, (say they) most of the Demonstrations in Mathematicks are grounded upon Numbers, which are but *Unities* added together, subtracted, combined, or multiplied; if we will not allow, that one *Unity* added to another make *two*; or one *Unity* added to *two*, make *three*; we cannot be sure or certain of any thing we pretend to demonstrate. But if the *Mystery* of the *Trinity* be true, all this may be false: For in the *Mystery* of the *Trinity* we are taught, that the Father is Lord and God, that the Son is Lord and God, and really distinct from the Father; and that the Holy Ghost is Lord and God, and really distinct from the Father and the Son; and yet, that there is but one Lord God, one numerical Nature in the Blessed *Trinity*: So that if this Doctrine be true (conclude these Gentlemen) we cannot be certain of the Truth of any Demonstration

monstration grounded upon these evident Principles of the Mathematicks, viz. that *one* added to *one*, make *two*; and *one* added to *two*, make *three*, &c.

Now this is the Argument of the Author of, *The Absolute Impossibility of Transubstantiation Demonstrated*, and of others, *mutatis mutandi*, upon the Subject of the Evidence of our Senses. And yet notwithstanding, no good Mathematician, neither Sir *Isaac Newton*, for Instance, nor Monsieur *Cassini*, nor any other learned Mathematician, did ever question the Truth of their Demonstrations, founded in Numbers, tho' they believ'd the Mystery of the *Trinity*.

In like manner, no good Christian ought to question the Truth of *Transubstantiation*, tho' it may seem to be repugnant to the Testimony of our Senses. And why so? Because they are both, viz. the *Trinity* and *Transubstantiation*, Mysteries of Faith, are of a superior Order, above the Reach of our weak Capacity; and not to be measured with the short Line of human Reason. It's enough for us to consider, that they are Objects of our Faith, that they are credible, tho' not comprehensible; that our Reason tells us, we ought to believe them upon the Word of G O D, who can neither be deceiv'd himself, nor deceive us; tho' we cannot comprehend, nor weigh them in the Ballance of our weak Understanding.

Thus much, my Lord, may, I hope, suffice to shew that our Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is neither absurd nor unreasonable, notwithstanding what this good Gentleman;

tleman, and Others, may say to the contrary.

I shall now proceed to the third Thing, viz. the Reflection which your Grace makes upon the Prayer called the *Invocation of the Holy Ghost*, in the ancient Liturgies of the Oriental Churches.

Your Grace, *Reply*, Page 248. and in the three or four subsequent Pages, insists, that the Oriental Churches did not believe the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; because they did not hold the Consecration to be perform'd till after the Prayer, called the *Invocation of the Holy Ghost*, was made.

To this, I answer, First, That I have sufficiently shewed, in my Answer to your Grace's *Charitable Address*, upon this Head, by the very Words of all the Oriental Liturgies, and the express Passages of the most eminent *Greek Fathers*, the Oriental Churches did always believe *Transubstantiation* to be a Doctrine delivered by Christ and his Apostles.

Secondly, That whereas the See of *Rome* and the *Western Churches* never reprov'd, or found Fault with the *Eastern Churches* upon the Subject of the Eucharist, even since their great Schism in the Time of *Photius*, or before it; it is equal to a Demonstration, that there was no Difference in Faith between the *Eastern* and *Western Churches* upon that Subject: For if there had been any, the Bishops of *Rome* would not fail to admonish them, to reproach them, and even excommunicate, or cast them out of the Society of the Faithful, as they

they had frequently done even to the very Bishops of the *Patriarchal See's*, as often as they broached any new and heretical Doctrine.

Thirdly, That it is nothing material to our present Debate, whether or no the Oriental Churches did believe the Prayer called the *Invocation of the Holy Ghost*, was an essential Part of the Consecration of the *Host* and *Chalice*: For since they believed the Transubstantiation to be effected, at least, after the said Prayer was made, that is all I did then, and now contend for.

The Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and the *Greek Bishops*, assembled in the Council of *Florence*, did, indeed, declare by the Mouth of their Prolocutor, *Isidorus*, Metropolitan of *Syria*, that all the Oriental Churches did believe the Consecration to be made and the Change effected by the Words of Christ, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*.

Upon the whole, our present Debate is not, whether the *Greeks* believed the said Prayer to be Part of the Words of Consecration; but whether or no they did always, before and after the said Council, believe the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; and, I think, I have sufficiently proved in my Answer to your Grace's *Charitable Address*, upon this Subject, that they did.



TO THE EIGHTH CHAPTER.

I Shall say but very little upon this Head :
For, I think, I have said enough in the
same Chapter in Answer to your Grace's
Charitable Address, to shew, that to take
the Sacrament in both Kinds, was not es-
sential to the worthy Participation of the
same.

Your Grace says a great many things to
invalidate my Proofs, to which, I beg I
may be dispensed from making any An-
swer; because I am of Opinion, they have
been sufficiently answered, at least, where
there is any real Difficulty in what I had
said before upon this Subject.

The main Stress of your Grace's *Reply*
upon this Head, consists in this; that the
positive Command of Christ is to all Men,
as well Laity as Clergy, to take the Sacra-
ment in both Kinds, at least, when they
can possibly receive Both. And conse-
quently, that to take the Cup is as essential
to the worthy Participation of the Sacra-
ment, as the taking of it under the Species
of Bread.

To

To this I answered before, and now answer, that if it was so, the Holy Catholick Church, the beloved Spouse of Jesus Christ, to whom Jesus Christ himself promised to send the Holy Ghost, to guide her into all Truth; would never suffer the Laity, upon any Pretence whatsoever, to receive the Sacrament in one Kind: Because, in so doing, (if both Kinds were essentially necessary) they would receive no Sacrament at all, but rather prophane that Holy Institution. For take away an essential Part from any Thing, you destroy the Whole: Take away the Soul from the Body, and you destroy the whole Man: Take away an essential Part from the Sacrament, and you destroy the whole Sacrament.

Now, That the Catholick Church, in all Ages, did knowingly and wittingly suffer the Laity to receive the Sacrament in one Kind, is evident from the many Instances which I brought in my *Answer*, of the *Solitaries*, of the *Sick*, of *Travellers*, of *Children*, and of the *Domestick Communion* of the Faithful in the primitive Times; and all these attested by Holy Fathers, by Ecclesiastical Writers, and by Historians of undoubted Credit: Which, surely, the vigilant Pastors of the Church, who saw these things practised, as I may say, before their Eyes, would never suffer, but wou'd look upon it as a Prophanation of Christ's Institution, had they thought or believed, that it was essentially necessary for the worthy Participation of the Sacrament, to take it in both Kinds. When it

is evident, that the least Errors in Faith or Practice of the Doctrine of Christ did in all Ages so alarm them, that they immediately rose up, wrote against them, and with their Anathema's, proscribed and cast out of the Church the Authors and Abettors of such Errors.

Your Grace, Reply, Page 287. saith;
 " Supposing then (but by no means granting)
 " ing) that the Cup is not an *essential* Part
 " of the Sacrament; yet since it is equally
 " commanded with the *Bread*, it must at
 " least be looked upon as an *integral*
 " Part of the Institution: And if the Sacra-
 " ment may without it retain its *Essence*;
 " yet still it will be defective and imper-
 " fect; as a Man would be by the Loss of
 " any of his Limbs, altho' he would still
 " retain the *Essence* of a Man, as long as
 " he remains alive.

I answer, That to take the Sacrament in one Kind, does not deprive the Laity of any *essential* or *integral* Part of it: For the whole and entire Body and Blood Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, being as well under the Species of either Kind as of both; whoever receives the Sacrament under the Species of Bread, or under the Species of Wine, taketh not only the *essential*, but also the *integral* Parts of the Institution of Christ.

I should here take my Leave of this Chapter, but that I think it very just to give your Grace satisfaction upon a Passage in a Book, Entituled, *A modest and true Account of the chief Points in Controversy, &c.*
 where

where the Author speaking of the horrid
Prophanations which (he says) must inevitably
attend the Communion in both Kinds, in a de-
generate Age, in which all Piety and Godliness
are almost extinct; and whereof we have sad
Instances in our Adversaries Practice; it being
frequently boasted by many of their Libertines,
that after hard Drinking over Night, they come
in the Morning to receive the Communion, and
drink off whole Communion-Cups of consecrated
Wine, to quench their brutish Thirst. Your
Grace hereupon says, that this is a horrid,
groundless, false Calumny. I assure your
Grace, it is my sincere Opinion, the Au-
thor would not advance a Thing so odious,
if he had not been well assured of the
Truth of it: Nor did he intend it as a Re-
flection upon the Church of England, but
only to expose the Abuse which some Li-
bertines make of Sacred Things; and of
whom, there are but too many in the
Church of Rome, as well as in the Church
of England.

Here, my Lord, I shall put an End to my *Rejoinder*. As to your Grace's *Reply* to the Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Chapters, I shall make no Remarks upon them; being persuaded that all the real Difficulties and weighty Objections contained in them are either coincident with other like Difficulties and Objections already considered; or have been directly answered (as the Occasion offered) in my *Rejoinder*, or in my *Answer* to your Grace's *Charitable Address*. I will therefore conclude with the same hearty Prayer for your Grace, which you had

had the Goodness to put up to GOD for
me; and beg Leave to subscribe my self,
with the most profound Respect,

My LORD,

Your Grace's most

humble and and most

obedient Servant,

C. NARY.

FINIS

6 11-12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000

21 JA 50

E R R A T A

Page 10. Line 34. dele to Tim; p. 37. l. 11. read
Monothelites; p. 43. l. ult. r. Jewels; p. 52.
l. 2. r. not one; p. 73. l. 9. r. Hebraos; p. 86. l. 2.
after the, add, whole; p. 111. l. 2. after Consecra-
tion, add, as in a Place. p. 118. l. 6. r. perceptible.

